CERTAINE BRIEFE NOTES VPON A BRIEFE APOLOGIE SET out vnder the name of the Priestes vnited to the Archpriest.

Drawne by an vnpassionate secular Priest, friend to bothe partyes, but more frend to the truth.

VVherunto is added à seuerall answeare vnto the particularites obiected against certaine Persons.

FORTE EST VINVM, FORTIOR EST REX, SED SVPER OMNIA VINCIT VERITAS ET MANET IN ÆTERNVM. 5. Esd. 3.



Imprinted at Paris, by PETER SEVESTRE.

VVith Priuiledge.

NOs subsignati Doctores Theologi Parisienses, ex relatu virorum fide dignorum testamur Annotationes has grauissimi & litteratissimi Viri D. H. Ely vtriusque iuris Doctoris peritissimi, in librum quemdam dictum Apologiam &c. Anglice scriptas, nihil in se continere contra fidem Catholicam aut bonos mores, sed multa cognitu dignissima, tractare erudite. In cuius rei fidem nomina nostra apposuimus.

IAC. LANGÆVS.

IOH. MVLOT.

A GENERALL PREFACE.

VERE it not à principle vvell knovven to all men by the very inſtinct of nature, that euery one hath greater reaſon to defend his good name, then any other parte off his riches: and that they principally, vvhoſe credites are neceſſarye for the behoofe of others, are by the lavve of God bound thereynto: I ſhould beſorie (I aſſure thee good Chriſtian reader) to heare of any more vvritinge of this lamentable ſubiect, of our ciuill diſſention, vvho ought (like bretherne) to lyue together in perfit peace and vnity. But hauinge read à moſt indiſcrete and odious Apologye [published vnder the name of vnited Prieſtes in the maintenance of a nevve founded Hierarchie,] vvhich VVan-

dering far and vvide from the Queſtion in controuerſie, ſeeketh occaſion to ſturre in the vnſauorye puddle of humaine trailties, ſuch as he deemeth to haue hapned amonge our poore exiled countrimen, for aboue this tvventy yeares : I could not (I ſay hauinge ſeen ſuch à pitifull peece of vvoorke) but eſteeme him to haue no feelinge of à true English nature in him, that vvould not be much moued at that not Onely Vnchriſtianlyke, but vnciuill and Barbarous behauiour ; and ſhould not alſo thinke it very requiſyte and neceſſarye, that à reaſonable anſvveare vvere retourned, to preſerue and defend our deare countryes, and countrymens reputation.

VVhich hath been the cauſe that M. Doctor Ely [à very auncient, vviſe & lednedPrieſte, lyuinge in honour and at his eaſe, far from his natiue ſoile, and farther from all ſuch debate and contention] hapeninge to read that venemous Apologye, could not hold his hande any longer, but quittinge his ovvne repoſe, haſtened to come to ſuccour them, vvhom he (to his greate griefe) perceiued, to be verye iniuriouſly ſet vpon and aſſailed. Not vnlike the good bloud in a mans body, vvhich feelinge the harte aſſaulted, flieth frō euery part, to aſſiſt aid and confort it.

And truly vvhoſoeuer knovveth this right vvourshipfull Doctor (as his auncient ſtādinge in the ſeminarie, euen from the beginninge, and his kind hoſpitality ſithence to all cōmers, hath made him vvel knovven to many:) cannot thinke it ſtrange, that his feruent affection vnto our Common father, CARD: ALLEN off godly memorye (vvith vvhom he vvas very intrinſecall) and his tender loue tvvardes vs all, hath pushed him on, to ſett penne to Paper and to imploy ſome parte of his goodly talent, about the deciſion of this controuerſy, and appeaſinge of our troubles.

And to ſpeake indifferently, vvho is there of our nation that ſhould be ſooner hearkened vnto, or better beleeued in this cauſe, then M. D. Ely? For firſt he not beinge partiall, but alike affected vnto both parties, (as in his Epiſtle folovvinge he shevveth at large) hath vvith all indifferency heard, read, and diligently peruſed, vvhat eyther ſide hath to ſay for them ſelues.

Then his ſound naturall iudgment, refined and accomplished vvith a profound knovveledg of both ciuill and canon lavve, (vvhereof he hath been publike profeſſor in a famous vniuerſity for many yeares:) inableth him, to diſcerne & ſee on vvhoſe ſide the right is. Finally his ſincere honeſty, voide off diſſimulation, full of Zeale to

truth and equity, maketh him bold to deliuer in plaine tearmes that vvhich in conscience he knovveth to be the verity.

VVherefore euery considerate an aduised reader, must needs giue singular regard to his opinion, and may vvithout any doubt safely relie vpon him, as vpon a most probable Authour.

Notvvithstandinge it is to be feared lest some [ouer vvillfully bent to dvvell in their ovvne errours, and vvho cannot in any sorte endure to be controled] not hauinge any exception against the vvorkman, vvill coyne some cauill against the vvorke, that so plainly discouereth their deceites: and not findinge any other pretext, may peraduenture say, that his holines Breue of the 17. of August 1601. Doth debarr them from readinge all such bookes as this is. VVhich scruple I thought expedient to remooue in this Preface. Because those good felovves that thrust into their blind folovvers handes, bookes flatly prohibited by that Breue, vvith vvarrantise: are as earnest on the other side to dissuade them from touchinge others: lest readinge them they should espie their errours, and so for sake them. First then it is to be considered that these learned notes of M. D. Ely come not vvithin the compas of the bookes forbidden by the Breue. Bicause

they be not vvritten by any of either party, to kindle more coales and to increase discord and debate: but by à charitable, discrete and indifferent person, to quench the flames of strife & to induce both sides to atonement. Againe yf ther vvere such à prohibited booke, yet may they novve be read securely, vvithout incurringe the perill of that Breue. For the sayd Breue vvas not at the first receiued and admitted.

The one part seeinge hovve it vvas abused appealinge from it. And the other, to vvitt M. Archpriest, deludinge and defeatinge of it. For it beinge sent to vvardes him frō Rome shortly after the 17. of August, and comning to his hande about Michaelmas, he kept it close and suppressed it vntill tovvardes the end of Ianuarye folovvinge; that in the meane season, the goodly peece of vvorke of their Apologie might be hatched: and then it peepinge out vvith an antidate, might seeme to the simple, to haue been made before the Breue.

VVhat boldnes and presumption vvas this? Vievvinge his hol. vvill and Commandement, vnder so seuere a penalty as the greater excommunication, euen holdinge his breue in his hande to be so audacious as at the very nose of it, to thrust out bookes so oposite to it, as darkenes is to light, vvas certainly to contemne it in the

higheſt degree, & to the greater ſcorne off it, they gaue out, that the breue did onely forbid bookes of our ſide, but admitted all of theirs. It beinge made vvithout partialitye as vvell againſt the one as the other. This vvas the firſt pageãt they plaid againſt it, but vvas this all? Noe. For ſome monethes after both the publishinge off the Breue, and their Apologyes, one in Latin, and another in English: To the infamye and exaſperation of diuerſe ſortes off perſons both Eccleſiaſticall and temporall, there creepeth forth an Appendix to them of the ſame railinge qualitye: vvhich very peartly playeth at bo-peepe vvith his holines Breue. The Author confeſſeth ingeniouſly, that he had in deed heard of ſuch a breue, but had not ſeẽ it: orels he vvould not for all the good in the vvorld, haue ſo violated it, for vvhat vvilfull contempt ſhould that haue been? and yet the ſeely man vvas ſo ouerſeen, as to relate in the ſame place the ſomme of it, and runninge ouer it orderly as it lieth, to cite certayne ſentences of it AD VERBVM, vvord by vvord. vvhich plainely bevvrayeth his diſſimulation, and declareth ſufficiently, that he had both ſeen and peruſed the Sayd Breue, but meant to jeſt vvith it. So obedient be they to the ſee Apoſtolike.

But I vvould faine knovve vvhat ſhift

they

they haue yet in ſtore for their larger Apologie vvhich is reported to be already published. Shall that alſo beare date before the breue? Or shall it be fathered vpon ſome one that lyeth in an vnknovven corner? vvho vvill ſay in like manner, that he had not ſeen the ſaid Breue: or vvhat other ioly deuiſe shall vve ſee next? be not theſe tovvardly and dutifull Children, vvho vnder the pretext of ſuch triflinge excuſes dare ſo delude and reſiſt our holie fathers authority? vve vvere by them ſtiled, enormous diſobedient, rebels, vvorſe thē Magitians and Idolaters, for that vve delaid to ſubſcribe to a lately deuiſed ſubordination, erected by a Cardinall his letter: vvhat doe they then deſerue to be called, vvho ſo vvilfully trangreſſed our ſupreme Paſtours Autentike vvritts? for euen as there is incomparable difference betvveen the Popes Parſon and a Cardinalls, betvveen his Breue and this man bare letter: ſo vvas there in that vvhich vvas commāded. For the Card: impoſed an intollerable burden vpon vs of that lavveles ſubordination: VVheras his holines charged vs onely to refraine from offendinge one an other by inuectiues and bitter vvritinge. Euerie one therfore that is not blinded by affection, May eaſly ſee vvhat Difference there vvas in the breach of thoſe tvvo co-

mandementes. I vvill here passe ouer a fift pamphlet. VVhich they haue also put to light since the Breue. Because the subiect of it is so absurd in it self, and so vngratefull vnto all our Catholikes that be in persecution, that it cannot be vvelcome into England. It is [if it please you] that vve notvvithstandinge our longe indurance of manifold afflictions, should not accept of a tolleration in matters of religion, noe not yf her maiestie of her singular clemency, vvould offre it vnto vs. Need you heare any more? do you not thinke these men to haue lost four of their fiue sences? or els that lyuinge to lõge out of guneshott at their ease, haue cast of all humaine compassion of their Bretherne? and shall vve be so assotted on them still that vve vvill vphold all they Say? And rather indure any hardnes then once mislike their folish opinions? But to returne to our purpose, seinge they haue four or fiue tymes by ouuert act gone against that his Hol. Breue, they haue made it frustrat & of noe force For (as the learned Casuistes hold) after a Superiours lavve or precept published, is by tvvo or three open actes contraried and resisted: it doth not bind any longer, vvhen the Superiour vnderstandinge off it, doth not rebuke or punnish such transgressors and renevve his former de-

cree. Nowe we haue longe since giuen his hol: to vnderstand, by his Nuncios in France and Flanders, and by our Brethern at Rome, of their often violatinge off the sayd Breue; and yet he stirreth not in it which signifieth that he is content that Breue expire, and bind no longer. But as I aforesayd, if the Breue did stand in former force and vertue, yet it comprehended not these notes, written so modestly, by such à Venerable Person, who in the spirite of mildnes charitably commendeth or reprehendeth both parties, as he taketh eyther of them to haue deserued. And here I would end this preface, were it not that I thought it expedient in this place to examine briefly, that which is cited in the Apologye out of Card: Allens letter vnto M. Mush. For that he nowe folowinge out common cause at Rome, cannot as yet answeare for him self. After the good Card. had exhorted vs secular Priestes to loue, honour, and respect one another, accordinge vnto euerye ones age, order and profession, he hath these wordes: *Cap: 2. f: 11.*

And those of the secular order, specially those that haue been brought vp by the fathers, and haue found so greate loue, charity and helpe at their handes (as verye fewe of late haue done) to be correspondent in all gratitude and thankfulnes, reuerencinge them in worde and deed, as

is requisite to their merites and callinge, &c.

Out of vvhich vvordes the Ieſuites and their adherentes drawe, the Card: to haue been of opinion, that the ſecular Prieſtes ſhould take them for their Superiours, or at leſt, ſhould giue them the preeminence in all places. All vvhich is far vvide both from his vvordes and meaninge. For as I vvill not ſay but that they, VVho haue found Courteſie at their handes, are tied to acknovvledge and requite it: ſee doe I affirme, that to fish out of his vvordes any kind of ſuperiority or equality either vvith ſecular Prieſtes, ſauoreth of Ambition; the Card; I graunte aduiſeth and chargeth vs to reuerence them, accordinge to their callinge: but their callinge and profeſſion requireth not, that they be preferred before vs, as out of the Auncient Fathers, and holy canous may be proued at large: but this place doth not permit it: take for a taſt the decree of a councell holdē at Rome abovve 1300. paſt, vnde pope Silueſter, vvhere (charge beinge giuen that inferiours giue reuerence to their Superiours) it is declared vvho be thoſe Superiours and inferionrs, in theſe vvordes as it is related in the decrees. PORRO PONTIFICI PRESBITER, ET CET. *Let the Prieſt do rerence to the Bishope. The deacon to the Prieſt. The Subdeacon to the Deacon. Tha Aco-*

dist 93. li: a Subdiaconus.

lite to the Subdeacon, the exorciſte to the Acolite, the lector to the exorciſte, the porter to the lector; OSTIARIO ABBAS, ABBATI MONACHVS IN OMNI LOCO REPRISENTENT OBSEQVIVM: let the Abbote giue obeiſance vnto the keper of the church dooer in all places aſvvell in publike as vvith in the church; as the monke Doth to the Abbote. behold the iudgment of the primitiue church concerninge ſecular Prieſtes and religious, in their opinion (vvhich vvas moſt pure and ſound) a ſecular Prieſt ſo far excelleth a religious man: that the Abbote vvho is Chiefe amonge them, is to exibite and to doe reuerence, vnto a dore keper the meaneſt miniſter aut attendant vpon a ſecular Prieſt. VVhich is confirmed by another Canon taken out off that true religious, and moſt learned Doctor of the Church S. Hierome. *VVho beinge demaunded by Heliodorus a Bishope, vvhether the order of ſecular Clerkes, or of the religeous vvere more vvorthy, gaue anſvvere that the order of Clerkes vvas far vvorthier*, And proueth it by four ſeueral reasõs as is to be ſeen in that place. One of the principall is, that they are of the eccleſiaſtical hierarchy theyr callinge beinge to take charge of ſoules, to teach others the vvorde of God, and to adminiſters the holy ſacramentes, vvhich are the diuineſt offices, that the Al-

Cap. 16. q. 1. alia cauſa.

mighty hath communicated vnto men. And therefore sayd this great holy father. MIHI ANTE PRESBITERVM SEDERE NON LICET. It is not lavvefull for me to sit abovve a Priest. True it is (as the glosse vpon the former place signifieth) that since the religious tooke holy orders, an Abbote is to take place afore a secular Clearke; but noe other monke or religious. As the ordinary practise of the Christian vvorld in publike processions and all other solemne assemblies Doth make most manifest. VVhere the precedence is alvvayes giuen vnto the secular. And that these sharpe censurers take no exception of the vvord MONACHVS, vsed in the former places. and say that secular Priestes be there onely put before monkes, but not before such religious as they are: it is to bee vnderstood, that in those Authors, MONACHVS, is taken for all sortes of religious, for that in those dayes there vvere not other maner of religious: or yf they vvill needes haue a distinction betvven them: then monkes vvilbe the vvorthier, and must march before other poore friers, as the ordinary course of the vvorld allovveth. And amonge all mendiants, or beggingefriers (in vvhich order the Iesuites recken them selues) they are to march in one of the lovvest ranckes not onely

becauſe, their ſocieti is one of the laſt foũded, but alſo for that they haue fevveſt religious obſeruances; they not beinge bound to rough and rude apparell, often and longe faſtes, or continuall riſinge at midnight to Canonicall houtes, as other ligious mẽ are the, kepinge onely the eſſẽtiall vovves of religiõ: of vvhich alſo ſome tearme all thoſe that haue not made their laſt profeſſion but tenantes at vvill, and noe freeholders. For vvhen it ſhall pleaſe their generall to dimitt them, they incõtinẽtly become ſecular & be no lõger Religious. All vvhich I ſay, (God is my vvitnis) not to diſgrace any order of the religious, for albeit in the rãcxes of the vvorld they be the lovveſt: Yet in the ſight of God for vvhoſe ſake the leaue all, they may be of the hieſt, yf they excell in vertue: as many good deuoute poore vvoman, ſhall in the xingedome of heauen, be placed far abovve many ladies not ſo vertuous as they. Yet as vve giuinge the place to a lady before a poore vvoman here, do not offend God or man: ſo vvhoſoeuer preferreth a ſecular Prieſt afore a religious man, doth not offend againſt Card. Allens graue aduiſe, of giuinge them ſuch reuerence as is requiſite to their callinge. Their vocation beinge inferiour to the other, as hath been prooued. Neither can the addition of re-

ligious ioyned vnto their Priesthood gre-atly aduãce thẽ (of vvhich yet I haue heard some to bragg) vvhen as the hiest dignity of religion, is not equall vnto a poore portershipp in the church of God, as is by record of antiquity abovve declared.

And becauſe I am a litle entred into this matter, I vvill to this purpoſe add one ſentence more, out of the next Canon of the ſame queſtion. The ſumme and ſubſtance vvhereof is, that it is not lavvefull for monkes and religious to do any thinge (ſpecially belonging vnto the eccleſiaſticall hierarchie), vvithout the counſaile of Prieſtes. Thus taught bleſſed S. Hierome 1000. agoe: and this holy charch eſteemed conuenient to be rãged amonge her ſacred decrees. VVhat shall vve then ſay to thoſe vviſemen, vvo leppinge out of the limittes of their ovvne profeſſion, durſt avovve, that Prieſtes vvere out to be truſted vvith the guidinge of the conſciences of layfolkes, vnleſſe they depended on ſome religious man. The diſcipline of holy church ſendeth religious for direction and Counſail, vnto ſecular Prieſtes: this vnaduiſed vvriter cleane cõtrary, vvould not haue ſeculat prieſtes credited vvith the charge of ſoules, yf they be not ruled by ſome religious: vvhich is alſo ſo much the more abſurd for that the managinge

Ca. 16. q. 1. Eccleſ.

naginge of lay persons spirituall saluation apparteyneth most properly vnto secular Priestes, that beinge their peculiar vocation and profession. And (as all men confesse,) God most assuredly assisteth and concurreth, vvith those instrumentes, of vvhich he maketh choise him self for any purpose: novve the very institution of secular Priestes by our blessed Sauiour, vvas to giue them the charge of both conuerting, instructinge, and guidinge mens soules into the knigedome of heauen: vvherfore by the diuine lavve of his ordinarie prouidence, he doth more specially perfitt this his holy vvorke by the seruice of secular Priestes, then by any other vvhat soeuer. He then that leaueth them, and seeketh after others for the directinge of his conscience, may be resembled to him that forsaketh the hight vvay, and folovveth bypathes, of vvhich he cannot bee so vvell assured.

For as I take religious men to be the fittest tohandle religious affaires so it cānot vvith any colour of reason be denied but that secular Priestes are the most proper for the conductinge of secular mens consciences. And therfore I chiefly take them to be cal*secular*, for that they liue in the vvorld to be lanternes and guides vnto vvorldly men. VVich should be a singular motiue

vnto all lay men, to caſt their eyes principally vpon them and to loue honour, and reſpect them abovve the reſt, as their ordinarie Paſtours, vvho haue quitt their ovvne friends and all other thinges to line and dye amonge them, and to aſſiſt them vvhih the vvord of life, and the holy ſacramentes liuinge and dieinge: VVheras the religious (loue they them neuer ſovvell) muſt needes forſake them on the ſudden at the commaundement of their Superiours.

VVhich I do not relate to Diminiſh in any ſorte the orderly affection, that any man or vvoman carieth tovvardes them: but to correct the fond opinion of them, that thinke nothing cã be vvell done vvith out them. And to complaine a litle of the incongruity of ſuch religious, vvho contrarie to their rule and profeſſion, plunge them ſelues ouer head and heares into eccleſiaſtical affaires, vvith ſuch audacity and obſtinacy, as they haue tourned all topſie turnie. And hovve can it almoſt be other vviſe ſo longe as they meddle ſo peremtorily in matters, vvherin they haue verie ſmale ſkill: h auinge neither ſtudied much in the holy canons, by vvhich principally the diſcipline and regiment of the church is directed: nor had any greate practiſe in eccleſiaſticall affaires; they li-

uinge as it vvere out of the vvorld, in a di-ſtincte and far different gouernmente. And finally God doth ſeldome bleſſe their enterpriſes vvith good ſucceſſe, vvho runne before he ſend them, and intet-meddle farther then they haue comiſſion from him or his vicar and vicegerent in earth. VVhefore (to conclude) I moſt hartely requeſt them, to retire them ſelues vvith in their ovvne boundes, and to obſerue that golden rule, REGVLARIA REGVLARIBVS, lett religious men deale in matter appertayninge to religion and the cloiſter: and leaue SECVLARIA SECVLARIBVS. The orderinge of the Common affaires of the church, to ſecular Prieſtes, and ſo vve ſhall come to line quietly togither. VVhich Almighly God, of his infinite mercy and goodnes grannt vs ſpedely, throught the merites of our bleſſed Sauiour, Chriſt Ieſus.

Amen.

THE OPINION OF M. ROB PARKINSON PRIEST

and licenciate in diuinitie touchinge this controuerſie vvith M. Archprieſt: vvhith is vvord for vvord taken out of a letter of his oſt the laſt of May 1602. The vvhich vvas thought vvorthy the relatinge, bicauſe he vvas longe ſince Card. Allen Confeſſour and one of the ſeniours and readers in the ſeminary at Rhemes.

In his ſecond aſſertion to-vvars the end he hath theſe vvordes

I Knovve alſo by relation of many and am fully perſuaded, that you haue ſuſtained iniuries by the erection of your Archiprieſt, and ſome Ieſuites: and I confeſſe vnto you vnfainedly, that if you

had kept your ſelues, vvithin the cõpas of your Appeale, and plainely and orderly propoſed to the ſee Apoſtolike (vvhere at firſt although you vvere repelle, yer in the end doubtles, you should haue had audience and iuſtice) I vvould neuer haue giuen any ſigne in miſtike of your doinges, but rather to the vtermoſt of my povver, haue furthered it, as iuſt and lavvefull.

In his poſtſcript thus he ſaith.

YF God ſpare me health and life: fine dayes together, I vvill vvrite to F. Perſons, concerninge many cõplaintes, that I haue heard off his hard dealinge vvith our youthes at Rome, and likevviſe off the nevve erection off the Archipriеſt in England. It vvas thought of longe before F. Perſons. began it: and by Gregorie the 13. ſuppreſſed and forbidden, as a iuriſdiction, vvhich could not be practiſed in England. I ſuppoſe F. Perſons did it vvith good intention, &c. But by ex-

perience and contradiction, he should haue forseeu the misehiefe that vvas like to folovve, and sought meanes hovvetopreuent it, rather then by force andauthority, to beare it out.

Thus much by the vvay the good old man vvrote vvel. But in his maine discourse against our soueraine lady, he very grosly goeth against the comõ opinion and practise of all our learned countrimen. VVhich may be imputed partly to his lacke of experience, and partly to those his superiours: that commanded him so to doe, as there he confesseth. Some of the same humour obiect as a great faulte vnto diuerse vertuous Priestes and Auncient Confessours, that they in faire humble sorte deale vvith the temporall magistrate, about their ovvne deliuerance, and for the manifold eases of sondry others. VVhere nothinge is more euident by the very light of nature, then that vve may by all honest meanes possible, both helpe our selues and do good to all others. And yf

vve needed in ſo cleere a caſe any longer probation; I could by many examples, of the moſt Auncient, beſt learned, and valianteſt Chriſtiãs, both Martirs and Cõfeſſours, couuince it to be neither vnhoneſt nor dishonorable, for Catholikes in perſecution to fly vnto the clemency of them in vvhoſe hãdes they are, and in moſt ſeemely humble maner to beſeech thẽ to haue cõpaſſion, on ſuch their poore afflicted countrimen, as be ready to ſpẽd their beſt blounde either to do any of them good in particular, or for the ſeruice of their country in generall. But ſome doe ſay, bevvare of the coũcel, they meane onely to deceyne you, but vvil do you noe good: vve confeſſe their honours to ſurpaſſe out brethern in vvitt and policy exceedingely, yet hope, by the helpe of God, that ours are of ſufficient diſcretion to looke to them ſelues: and their longe tried conſtancy in priſon, doth vvith any indifferent man vvarrant them from all ſuſpition of trachery in the Catholike cauſe, vntill there be plaine proofe to the contrary. on the other ſide, are not the hartes of princes in the handes of God? and are not all men inclinable to mercy, vpon true declaration of our innocency? it is thẽ rather a ſingular bleſſinge of God, thẽ matter of exclamatiõ, to haue obtained the fauorable eare of our gouer-

nours, that vve may haue the opportunity to purge our ſelues frō thoſe heinous crimes of attemptinge euill againſt her maieſties roiall perſō, or dealinge vvith fotraine nations about an inuaſiō; of vvhich through the ſiniſter information of our aduerſaries, vve haue been heretofor holdē in great ielouſy. It may be that they vvho are not ſo vvel able to diſcharge them ſelues of ſuch imputatiōs, diſlike of this fauour: fearinge leſt their by, their plottes be eaſlier eſpied and them ſelues become more odious. But the innocet (vvho is by that meanes like to find more fauour) muſt acknovvledg him ſelf much bound vnto vnto that venerable Auncient Prieſt and Cōfeſſour M. Bluett, yf he haue (as the Apologie reporteth) in ſome part pacified the vvrath of our Gratious Princeſſe, and of her right honorable councell tovvars the moſt part of vs, by cleeringe vs from the ſuſpition of the aforeſaid vvicked attēptes: and yf he could not do as much for ſome others (it beinge ouer vvell knovven vnto the coūcell, that they had meadled to to much in ſuch matters) he is not to be clamed, yf he lett the fault lye vvhere it vvas, and leave them to anſvveare for them ſelues. But I refer it to himhim ſelfe (vven he ſhall haue leiſure) to treate of this ſubiect more at large.

AN ANSVVEARE VNTO THE PARTICVLARS OBIECTED in the Apology againſt Maſter Doctor Byshope.

CONSIDERINGE that nothinge can be more iuſt and honorable, then to defend graue and innocēt men, ſpecially ſuch, vvhoſe trauailes haue been very profitable vnto the church of God, in the ſeruice of their countrie: I truſt that my paines ſhall not diſpleaſe the indifferent reader, if I doe beſtovve one chapter, in the defence of the vvourshipfull PRIEST M. DOCTOR BISHOPE. VVho beinge vvell deſcended, and trained vp accordingely in vertue and learninge, for the loue

of the Catholicke Religion and hooly Orders, forsooke the hope of 200.l of yearly inheritance, and ledd in the Colledges abrode, an exemplare life. VVhence retourninge home Priest, he vvas taken and cast into prison, for his professiō. VVhere for three yeares space, he did good seruice to the cause, by often exhortations vnto his felovv prisoners, and in disputations vvith many accounted learned Ministers: Conuertinge by the grace of God, diuers vnto the faith, and amonge others six vvho abovve this Dozen yeares, beinge Priestes, haue laudably laboured in their vocation. At length banished into France, he renued his study in diuinity, in the renovvmed vniuersity of Paris, and in fiue yeares finished the laborions course of Sorbone, as much to the credite of our country, as to his ovvne good and preferment.
Aftervvard retourninge into England, imploied his talent amonge his country men, abovve seauen yeares at liberty, noe lesse helpinge his brethren the Priestes, then soccouringe many poore Catholikes: all vvhich notvvithstandinge, because he moued of Charity, did trauaile, to preuent those pitifull broiles and contentions, vvhich he forsavv longe ere they brake out, he is in sondry places of that Vnchristian Apologie, not a litle touched in reputatiō,

but very vvrongefully, as by anſvveringe to all that therin is layd againſt him, I vvill novv lett you vnderſtande.

Firſt then before the preface of that Apologie, vvhere the principall Authours of tvvo booke, (vvritten againſt M^r. Archprieſt, F. Perſons and their complices) are ſcored vpp, M.D.Byshope is ſaied to be one of the three, that haue put their names in printe vnto diuerſe partes of thoſe bookes.

I hartely deſire the vpright reader, to runne thoſe tvvo bookes ouer the one is in English, containinge the copies of certaine learned diſcourſes, ther other in Latin, intitled, DECLARATIO MOTVVM ET CET. And yf he find D. Byſp. His name, at any other part thereof then at one letter of his ovvne, vvritten in anſvvere vnto an other of F.per. to him: lett him hardly repute this nameles Author (shrouded vnder the shadovve of vnited Prieſtes) for ſuch a one, as may be beleeued on his vvord. But yf not, as in truth it is not, then bevvare hovve you truſt him hereafter vvho beginneth at the firſt to deceaue youi againe, neither did M.D.By: put his name in printe, Vnto that his letter: but others deſtringe to make knovven to the vvotld hovve ſome thinges had paſſed, cauſed it to be printed: as they did alſo F. par. letter.

vvith his name at it. VVherfore yf he muſt needs be holden for one of the chiefe doers in thoſe bookes, becauſe one letter therin is ſubſigned vvith his name: By as good reaſon F. par. him ſelf, may be reputed and taken for a principall Author off them: his name beinge a ſvvell ſett dovvne in printe to a letter in them. And albeit D. By. make farr better account of thoſe bookes, then F. P. doth, neuer the leſſe it is as vntruly inferred of him, as it ſhould be off F. P. that he vvas one of the principall doers in them. Soe that in one line almoſt, & that the firſt vvhich toucheth D. By. there are tvvo vntruthes: one in that he ſaith him to haue ſett his hand to diuerſe partes off thoſe bookes, vvhen it is but at one onely: The other in avouchinge him to haue put il to, in printe vvhen others did that, and not he. See (I pray you) vvhether this Apologiſt, be not like to prooue an vnfortunate pilote, that thus before he put to ſea, maketh ſhipvvracke of his credite, as it vvere in the hauen. Of like ſorte is that vaine florish of his vvhere he ſayeth,

Cap. 19. f. 129.

Neither is that fond ſhift vſed by D. By. in his anſvvere, and by this felovve cenſurer vpon F. P. letter, of any valevve vvith men of iudgment, but rather ſhevveth that they proceed not by cõſcience, but ſeeke euaſions by cauillation, vvhen they ſay, that the Notary beinge a father off the

Colledg, might put in and out vvhat F. P. vvould haue him &c: all this is nought els but a fõd amplification of a very tale: for their is noe one ſuch vvord of that Notary in all M. D. By: letter, as euery one that liſt, may ſee.

Of the ſame baſe qualitye is this counter-point of his, to vvitt, that his holines Breue made in confirmation off the Protectors letters vvas dated the 6. of Apriell 1599. And yet in the ſame chapter ſhortly after in fauour of one of F. P: letters, that Breue is made to beare date of the 21. of Apriell. *Ca.* 10, *f.* 140. *f.* 143.

But vvhy ſtand I to note by the vvay as it vvere for a taſt, ſome of thoſe groſſe mis-hapen forgeries, vvhen as vvith the like paltry ſtuffe is patched vp admoſt all that peeuish Apologye. it grieueth me I aſſure you to haue to doe vvith ſuch a peltinge aduerſary, QVI POSVIT MENDACIVM SPEM SVAM, vvhoſe vvhole confidence lieth in conninge conueiance of lyes: But beinge driuen for the neceſſary defence of my deere friends honour, to coope vvith ſuch a mate, I muſt intreate the gentle reader ro beare vvith me, yf I doe novv and then, take him vp, ſome vvhat roundly. before I enter into the particulars of M. D. Byſhops negotiation, I vvill ſpeake a vvord or tvvo in behalfe of that piththy and graue ſentẽce of the Sorbon Doctours (vvho declared thoſe Prieſtes, that delaid to recei- *Of the Sorbons ſentence.*

Cap. 8. f. 116. & 317. ue M. Archpriest, vntill his hol, Breue, not to haue offended) becauſe D. By, is coated in the margent to haue been one of the ſollicitors of it. Many oddidle exceptions are there by the Apol. taken againſt that vveighty and ſound declaration: VVherof ſome are in the former learned notes, very ſufficiently reiected, yet ſo, as ſome vvhat more may be therunto added.

Certayne it is firſt, and there vvell proued; that the addition of protectour, vnto the title of a Cardinall, vvas impertinent to that purpoſe. Becauſe that circumſtance altered not the caſe, in giuinge either any nevve povver to his perſon, or more credyte to a Card: it beinge of far meaner quality, then the dignity of a Cardinall.

The ſecond exception is, for that in the information of the ſayd dd, it vvas related, that the Card: inſtituted that ſubordination, SEQVENS VOLVNTATEM SANCTISSIMI: VVheras the Apol. averreth it to haue bin done EX SPECIALI MANDATO, by his hol: ſpeciall commandemēt. Although he repete this often, and vrge it greatly yet is it a very fiction, vvithout any good ground or probabilitye. For in the Card. his letter of M. Arch. Conſtitution, are theſe expreſſe vvordes NOS SANCTISSIMAM ET PROVIDENTISSIMAM VOLVNTATEM SEQVENTES, HOC I-

PSVM STATVERE DECREVIMVS: *VVe (saith the Card.) folovvinge the most godly, and most prouident vvill of his holines, haue determined to institute this subordination.* VVhich are the very vvordes vsed by the informers. Novve those tearmes, EX SPECIALI MANDATO, are put dovvne before in the proeme about a nother matter, of makinge atonement betvven the lay Catholike gentlemen and the Priests, as in the letter it selfe novve in printe, is evidently to bee seen vvherefore as many tymes as the Apol: doth inculcate in this matter, HIS EX SPECIALI MANDATO, (vvhich he doth often) so many tymes doth he tell a speciall vntruth. *Relat. cõp. pag.* 11.

The third exception is that the informers concealed, hovve the subordination vvas demaunded by the English Priestes; true it is that noe mention vvas made of that, because they knevve it to be most false. As hath been often hertofore declared.

Fourthly he excepteth against these vvordes off the information: *many Priestes refused to subscribe vnto that subordination: vvhen* (as he signifieth) *there vvere scarce ten that refused so to doe:* VVhat voluntary lesinge is this? they knevve full vvell, That D. By and his companion M. Charnock, Caried vvith them more thē tvventy handes against it. Moreouer not they onely

vvho vvrote againſt it, refuſed to ſubſcribe to it, but all thoſe too, vvho vvould not meddle on eyther ſide. VVho vvere more in number, thē all they ſet togither, that vvere on both ſides formalli: vvhich partly by F. Liſters railing againſt neuters, partly by this vvorthy Authours reckening vp of thē that ſubſcribed, might be prooued, yf the matter vvere not cleere of it ſelf. For the Apol. accountinge them that ſubſcribed in particular, gathereth but 57, handes, to that ſubordination, comprehendinge the aſſiſtantes vvithall. So that of three hundred Prieſtes approbation, they euery vvhere vante and Bragg of, there vvere not threeſcore expreſsly for them. And conſequently not onely ten refuſed to ſubſcribe to that nevve Hierarchie, but more then tvvo hundred. novve to ſuppoſe that for breuityes ſake that Author (vvho is ſo ſuperfluous in recordinge many letters off leſſe momēt) vvould omit to ſet dovvne in Cipher at the leſt, the ſumma totalis of the reſt, vvere extreame folly. VVeigh alſo I pray you the aduantage they had ouer vs: as vvel through the colour of the Card: his authority, as by the aid of their 12. aſſiſtantes, and all the povver of the Ieſuites, vvith the terrour of takinge avvay facultyes & diſplacinge, and the thundringe out of ſchiſme: And can you maruell then, yf they obtai-

Cap. 8. f. 106. & 107.

ned

ned the handes of some fevve more, then vve could doe, beinge destitute of all those helpes? sithence many at more leisure hauinge cõsidered better of the matter, are come to ioyne openly vvith vs so that our Bretherne vvho novve are at Rome about it, had vvith them more handes for vs, then they haue sheued for them. But not to stray from these exceptions, the fift is a mere cauill. VVere he blameth the informers for saynig, *that they sent speedely to knovve his hol: pleasure. And vvere ready to obey it. As though (saith he) they meant then to yeeld, and to be quiet: vvhen as they neuer thought any such matter.* This he mightely presseth in enery Chapter almost, thorovve out his vvhole booke. But plaine proofe to the contrary is sett dovvne in the former notez by the protestation of all on our side, vvhich is also of record in the latin booke Dedicated to his hol, and in all other vvritinge of that tenour. And because it is a point of great importance, vvhether vve meant sincerely therein or noe, I vvill, to put it out of all doubt, recite the Confessions of our aduerse party, registred by them selues, in this their Apologie. First M. Archpriest in his letter of the 3. of June 1599. to F. Persons: giueth plaine testimony of it, in these vvordes: NOX PRAECESSIT, DIES APPROPINQVAVIT:

Pag. 61.

Cap. 10. l. 147.

dissentious is put to flight, PAX HABITAT IN TABERNACVLIS NOSTRIS, peace dvvelleth amongest vs M. Colingeton and M. Mush, haue procured the submisson, of M. Ed. Benet, vvatson, Champney an the rest. Note hovv they submitted themselues vpon sight off his hol: Breue. The same vvitnisseth F. Garnett (superiour of the Iesuites in England) sayng in one of his of the 26. off may to F. Persons. *I hope all vvilbe vvell, nay all is vvell alreaby. M. Colinglop and M. Mush submitted them selues to the Archpriest the 19. of may and promised to doe vvhat lay in them, to bringe in others.* VVhich also F. Persons himselt, in his to M. Mush, of the 17. of Iuly, acknovvledgeth. Finally this great Apologist, (vvhose sayinge you must take to be of as sound record, as the oracles of Apollo) cleerly deliuereth the same in the argumet of his teuth Chapter, thus: *Of the endinge of all*
Cap. 10, f. 141. *cantroversyes vpon publication off his holines Breue, and hovve by the art off the Common enemy, matters vvere brought, to vvorse Breach then before.* So that it is most manyfest, and vvas confessed by both partyes, that the Priestes not onely meant to yeeld and to be quiet, but vvere so in very deed, assone as they savvve his hol: Breue. VVhat vnspeakable malice and impudency, or dotinge blockishnes, (or vvhat shall I learne it?) is it then, to repete more then a hundreth

times ouer and ouer, that they neuer thougth, to ſubmitt them ſelues, to be quiet and to obey? do they not deſerue the prick and priſe off audacious and shameles lyeinge, that ſo often, ſo bodly and roundly gayneſay that, vvhich in expreſſe tearmes, they ſett dovvne them ſelues. Yf the reader be not vvilfully blind, he vvill eaſly diſcouer, ſee and deteſt ſuch shamefully falſe & moſt deſperate aſſertions.

The Sixt and laſt exception they take againſt that information is, *That there vvanted at Paris ſome body on the behalf of M. Archp: to haue shevved, their reaſons vvho informed againſt him, not to haue been good:* namely thoſe tvvo, to vvitt, *that the ſubordination ſeemed to be haue been granted, vpon falſe ſuggeſtion: and that there vvas great partiality vſed, in the choiſe of the Archp. and of hꝛ aſsiſtantes.* This the Apol. affirmeth: but doth he bringe any thinge in reproofe of thoſe tvvo reaſons? Litle or nothinge. He might in like ſorte bee put backe vvith a bare denialle but that I hold it not ſufficient in a different, to preſume vpon the readers credulity as he doth, but deſire to ginc him ſome ſatisfaction. VVherfore I vvill prooue thoſe reaſons to haue been very good. Firſt cõcerninge falſe ſuggeſtion, the tvvo principall cauſes, vvhy the Cardinall inſtituted the Archprieſt and that ſubordination

vvere both false, as by the Card: ovvne letters is euidently to be prooued. The former vvas generall, vvhich moued him to thinke off some good meanes of pacifeinge all partyes: *For that* (saith he) *Satan had stirred vp the lay Catholikes and the Priestes to knocke and beate one an other,* (VT INTER SE COLLIDERET:) *to the vtter ruyne of the vvals of Vnion, &c.*

Novve of this runninge one vpō an other, and vvarr betvven the lay Catholikes and Priestes, fevve I vvene euer heard of, besides these false suborned sollicitors, yet this grosse gooyeon they made the good Card: fvval ovve dovvne first: the other vntrue suggestion vvas, *That the English Priestes exhibited many gentle persuasions vnto his holines, for that rare hierarchicall subordination of an Archp:* and 12. Assistans. For as I haue abovve saide, either that matter vvas neuer spoken of in England, till it vvas dispatched in Rome: or in such secrecy, as it could not be, but a very shamefull lye, to beare his hol: in hand, that is vvas the Common request of the Priestes in England. It remaineth them most assured that there vvas very false suggestion in the Chiefest motiues of that subordination. Yea that the informers vsed great modesty in sayinge onely, there seemed such default, vvhen it vvas most apparant and manifest.

Concerninge the other reason off partiality in that choise of M. Archp: and his Assistantes, bicause I meane not to touch their Persons in particular, I vvill leaue it, to the vpright iudgment of them, vvho knovve their capacityes, and haue vvell obserued, their odd maner of proceedinge these fevve yeares past. Yet one plaine point of partiality may not be omitted, vvhich vvas in makinge choise of such to be arbiters, vvho vvere all affected vnto the one party; & therfore beinge no indifferēt men, vvere neuer like to compose matters and to make any perfitt atonement, as by the lamentable effectes of some yeares experience, all the vvorld no vve seeth. Thus much about the friuolous exceptiōs of the Apologist against the iuditious, and learned decision of the venerable facutly of Paris. VVhich proceedinge from deepe experienced men, vpon due consideration, must (no doubt) vvere passion beareth not the svvay, be holden for most sound and true: as his holines (beinge throughly informed by both partyes) hath already, VIVÆ VOCIS ORACVLO, declared it: and shalbe [as I hope] shortly published Authentically.

Vnto this sentence of the Doctors off Sorbone, is shall not be inconuenient to ioyne another act done at Paris, vvhich in

the Apologye is deliuered in theſe vvordes. *M. Charnock goeinge to Paris vvhere. D.B. reſided, both of them tooke ſcholedegrees vpon them, the one of Bacheler: the other of Doctor in diuinitye: not vvithſtandinge his hol, by an expreſſe Breue had forbidden the ſame vnto all Englishmen ſome yeares before, vvithout ſuch licence and approbation, as in the ſayd Breue is ſett downe.*

Fol. 154

Of the Breue againſt proceedinge.

The incongruity off this Breue is shevved in the former notes. For vvhat a diſgrace is it vnto good ſtudents, that vvhen their tyme of procedinge cometh, they muſt be caſt behind their felovves, yf they canet make friends both to the Rector off the Colledg, vvhere they ſtudied, vvhich may be in ſpaine; and to the Protector, vvho is ſuer ordinality to be no nearer then Rome. And ſo be forced both to leeſe their places in the vniuerſityes, and their preferment abrode. But vvhat cared the procurer off this breue for that: vvho ſeemeth to take greate pleaſure in bridlinge them, vvho be not at his becke, and in heapinge ſuch yokes of bondage vpon his poore afflicted contrimen, as no other nation I thinke in the vvorld is ſubiect vnto.

But to ſtand avvhile vpon this Breue; It may firſt be doubted, vvhether there be any ſuch or noe, it is ſo diuerſely reported. This Apologiſt (as you haue heard)

Maketh it to prohibite all Englishmen to proceed either bacchelor or Doctor in diuinity. The Copie reherſed in the former notes, ſaith nothinge of Bacchelars yet forbiddeth not onely Doctors in diuinity, but d. alſo in one of the lavves. A third (vvho ſuppoſeth he ſavve the orrginall it ſelf vvith the ſeale at it) affirmeth that neither Bacchelars in diuinity, nor Doctors in any of the lavves, but onely Doctors in diuinity are prohibited to proceed. Of other rumors that runn againſt licenciates I vvill not ſpeake, becauſe they hane no certaine hedd: but to vvhether of theſe three opinions, vvhich all come from the ſame fountayne muſt vve giue credite? or vntill there be better agreement about the matter, may vve not very vvell (for feare off doeinge vvrouge to the reſt) beleeue noe one of them? but rather ſuſpend our iudgment, and ſtay vntill vve ſhall ſee (accordinge to the lavve and Common practiſe of the vvorld) a Canonicall publicatron and reception of that Breue, in the Catholike Countrie, vvhere vve liue, and that ſo much the more in the Caſe of this Breue, as it ſeemeth to haue been obtained by ſurreption. Heare the preface of it: *Foras much as diuerſe yonge men goeinge from the Colledges took by the vvay the degree of Doctor in diuinity: vvhere vpon Cominge into England, and there*

takinge their place, accordinge to their degree, before many auncient graue Prieſtes, great diſorder did enſue &c cet. This is the preamble in ſubſtance, vvherein are tvvo falſehoods: the one that many yonge men had proceeded dd. on the vvay: vvhen one or tvvo at the moſt had ſo done, vvho for their ripe knovvleage in ſcholediuinity, vvere eſteemed vvorthy that degree. The ſecond vntrueth is, that any ſuch diſorder grevve of it in England: vvhere no graduat lightly doth take his place, Prieſtes ſeldome meetnige togither, and then in diſguiſed habits. Againe yf a yonge graduat, should take place before an elder man, yea better learned too then him ſelf: that vvould not bread any diſorder. The Common Cuſtome and order of all Chriſtendome beinge, that youger men hauinge taken degree, should be preferred before more aged, not alike qualified. This Breue then beinge granted. Vpon vvronge information, let others iudge of the validy of it. Concerninge M. D. Bishope, certaine it is, that he ſeauen or eyeght yeares before that Breue vvas gotten, had done all his actes, and had his grace giuen him to proceed Doctor. But not beinge ſo ambitions, (as they vvould make men beleeue) ſtayd tenn yeares after his due tyme, before he vvould ſtand in act to take the degree vvhich at lengh he tooke

beinge

beinge first by decree compelled to make his abode in the same vniuersity, and therefore could not vvithout his disgrace and great hinderance, put it of any longer. He then also to avoid braulinge and all colour of contempt, requested the Rectors Consent as the Breue goeth: but beinge vvithoust iust Cause refused, letted not to take the degree, folovving the best counsell in the vniuersity and citty; first for that he had, more then seauen yeares before the date of that Breue, taken some of the most substantiall pointes of Doctor Shipp: his exercises beinge all made, and his grace graunted: vvherfore such a penall decree as the Breue is, beinge to be restrained as much as may bee, can take no hold on him, that vvas so far passed into the degree before. Secondly for that this Breue vvas neuer published, much lesse receyued in France, vvhere he remained: and accordinge to a very probable opinion (vvhich by all learned mens cõsent, may in practise be followed, vvithout all perill of offence:) a decree made at Rome, and not published canonically in others countryes, hath noe force there, nor bindeth any man in that place. Thirdly noe humane lavve bringeth any obligation in conscience vvhen it is manifest, that the principall cause, for vvhich it vvas made ceesseth,

vvhich is to be gathered out of the pro-
eme that in this Breue is, to debarr y-
onge men from proceedinge. Vpon their
departure from the Colledges, before they
haue studied foure yeares after in some o-
ther vniuersity; novve this cause vvholy
ceased in D. By. Case. For from his depar-
ture fro the Colledg of Rome, vnto the
tyme of his proceedinge: VVas litle less
then tvventy yeares: and he had ten ye-
ares before the taxing of the degree, stu-
died almost six yeares in the noble vniuer-
sity of Paris, and venerable Faculty of Sor-
bone. So that it could not be any meanin-
ge of the Authour of the Breue (yf any
such be) to lett his proceedinge. yet be-
cause of a petty addition in the end of the
Breue (vvhich for his aduantage, this Apo-
logist vvould make the onely clause) he
did (to preuente all exceptions) ask leaue
of F. Persons: VVho vvas then Rector,
the vvich at that tyme he refused to gra-
unt, yet about a yeare after, not spoken to
about that matter, offred it of his ovvne
accord, and caused, both the protectors &
his holines, to ratify, confirme it, yf it
needed any such rehabilitation: as F. Per-
sons ovvne letters of the 28. of Iuly 1601.
to the said Doctor doe testifie. Mary all
this courtesy vvas after he had laboured
vnder hand vvhat he could, to haue the said
Doctorship called in question as it is very

credibly reported. VVhich might be the cauſe vvhy this Apologiſt, hauing taken to taske to ſtirr in all matters that ſound ill in his eares vvould not lett this paſſe, vvith out giuinge it one dashe vvith his blottinge penne.

Hauinge done vvith matters of Paris touching D. Byshope: lett vs novve come to the affaires of Rome vvich belonge to him, vvher firſt preſenteth it ſelfe, his apprehenſion, shortly after his arriuall vvhich beinge contrary to the courſe of lavve, contrary to equity and all good cuſtome, Hath been euer ſence greately misliked, and much complained of by many vertuous and vviſe men. VVherefore the Apologiſt caſteth about farr and neare, to find ſome colourable excuſe for that fact. And bringeth in tvvo or three bad ones nothing ſufficient to ſerue the turne. Firſt not that far ſcatched, out of certaine letters vvritten from Flanders, longe before there vvas any talke, of any ſuch matter as appeareth by the date of them: and beſides there is neuer a vvord in any of them either of thoſe meſſengers, or of that negotiation: and vvithall not one of them addreſſed vnto his holines. Hovve then could he Pike out of them any raiſonable cauſe to caſt Prieſtes in to priſon vnheard? Certaynly this Apol. VVittes be-

Of their apprehenſion.

Cap. 9. f. 123.

gin to faile him that to no purpose laid downe at large such impertinent letters. Touchinge the letter from douay, and that of D. VVorthingtons, both vvritten from partiall places and Persons, it is not meet that they be valued at more then their reason is vvorth, vvhich is iust nothinge. For (saith he) *Yf these Captaines of newe broiles doe find fauour, they vvill stirr vp great stormes in England, but yf they be kept downe vvith sharpnes, all vvilbe quiet.* You haue heard this diuines auguration: You haue also longe ere this seen the contrary euent. For they beinge hardly handled, much more trouble vvas raised then before: VVheras, yf they had been Courteously dealt vvithall, all might haue been quietly composed. So that this first kind of excuse, is far from the purpose. The second is not much better. VVhich vvas (say they) *That his holines beinge aduertised by his Nuncios from France and Flanders of their Cominge, resolued to haue comitted them at Farrara, yf they had come thither.* Here seeme to be more lies then lines. First there vvas at that tyme noe Nuncio in France (as far as I can learne) but a Legat the Card: of Florence, vvho had noe Correspondence vvith the Archpriest and therfore: neither receiued nor sent any such aduertissement. As for the right reuerend Nuncio in Flaūders he might vvell giue intelligence of

thoſe meſſangers cominge, but vvas to vviſe to vvish his holines to impriſon them, beinge ſent to his ſee about eccleſiaſticall matters, before they vvere heard. And for his hol: vvho is renovvmed through the vvorld, for his mild cõſiderate manner of proceedinge, vvithout any ſuch haſt and precepitatiõ, it is impoſſible, that he could vpon the onely clamours of aduerſaries, reſolue to Comitt Prieſtes before they vvere heard. Suerly they doe him no ſmale diſhonour, that ſo often and that in printe reporte ſo euil of him. But to that vvicked audaciouſneſſ ſome are novve grovven, that to excuſe themſelues, they ſtike not to lay there ovvne faultes vpon their ſupreme Paſtors Shoulders. VVhat then might be the cauſe, vvhy they vvere committed before they vvere heard? The right R: Bishope of modina (his hol: Nuncio in France after vvardes) hearinge hovve all had paſſed, ſaid that it might vvelbe done vvithout his hol priuity, By Card: Caetane his order, vvho beinge lord high treaſurer had ſergentes at his commandement, and ſo might commit of his ovvne authority; or it might be perhaps, that at Card: Caetanes greate importunity, his hol: hauinge heard many heynous complaintes againſt them, condiſcended, to haue them retired to the Col-

ledg to conferr in priuate after a friendly sort of their matters: meaninge nothinge lesse, then that they should be there vsed like prisoners, as they were, wel of this, our bretherne that nowe folowe the matter at Rome will be better able to say more here after.

But what I pray you were those complaintes, where with the pope eares were filled, against the messengers? forsooth, *That they were tumultuous and seditious fellowes, that they obstinately resisted the right R. Archp: and stirred vp many others to do the like, to the greate scandall of both Catholikes, and and Heretikes that they went about to discredit the pope and Cardinall: that they were come to Rome to make newe Garboiles in the Colledg, and finally would fill the court of Rome with rumours, yf they were not restrained.* These were those irreligious and damnable slaunders, which D. Byshope in his letter said were no lesse falsly then wickedly inuented against them, to haue them layd vp, before they were heard. Vnto which the Apo. answereth after his old fashion, cleane camme as they say: in this sort. *Is it*
fol. 177. *so heynous or damnable to restraine a coople of Priest,* Cap. 11. *where so many complaintes be made of their presumption, contempt and scandall raised by their contention? doth not euery Prince doe so?* No good Sir, not one iust Prince doth soe,

vvhen the parey presenteth him self, and meaneth to stand to his triall, as they did. For by vvhat lavve or reason can he vpon hear say', and fals bruites perhaps Chastise him: VVhom he may duly heare at leisure, & findinge him guiltye may punish accordinge to his desertes? But to our purpose, the enormous slaunders, vvhere of D. By: Complained in his letter, vvere (as euery one may see) not the Castinge of him and his Companiō in prison, as this Apol: misconstrueth it: But those vile and mischieuous rumours abovve rehearsed: to vvitt, that they vvere tumultuous and factious, and obstiuately disobedient to all sorte of superious & cet. VVhich faultes are as farr fro M.D.By: manners (of vvhom I novve treate) as vvhite is from blacke, and light from darknes. For his behauiour for tvventy yeares before, as vvell in the colledges as in all other places, vvas vvel knovven vnto all that knevve him, to haue been very mild and quiet: hauinge neuer had his finger in any such sturres, and therfore most iniuriously stiled, *tumultuous and seditious*. Moreouer vndertakinge that iourney to Rome at the request of diuers venerable personages, he vvas so farr off from maxinge any vprore against that late erected authority of the Archp: that he acquainted none of the house vvhere he ri-

sided, with the particulars of that affaire. Yea he conferred most quietly with M. Archp: him telt of the matter. Mary perceiuinge that no good Could be done therin with out F. Persons, on whom all depended: he determined for Cõmon quietnes, to vndertake that painfull and perillous iorney, giuinge vnder his hand the cause of his goeinge vnto M. Archp: and takinge with him a copy of it subscribed by M. Archp: that it might appeare vnto all, howve peaceably he departed from him. What presumption and contempt of the Archpriest, what dispargement to the Card. letters, what scandall and offence of the world in all this? Who seinge any thinge amisse, and desirous to seeke redresse of it, could more orderly or more quietly haue done it? The like mild and temperate course held they in Rome, presentinge them selues to both the Card. Protectors, and dealinge with F. Persons him self about some reasonable pacification of all parties: as in M. D. Byshops letter is to be seen more at large. Most false therefore were all those slaunders, with out all conscience cast out of them, and consequently very irreligious and damnable, as M. D. By: tearmed them. Now we lett vs come vnto their mission and Comission. Wherabout D. By: beinge asked,

of their mission.

aſked, vvho ſent them? VVith vvhat authority? VVhy he and his felovve abovve the reſt: and other like pointes: *VVas ſomevvhat troubled in his anſvveare, ſayinge,* NESCIO QVIS FVERIT: *I knovve not vvho vvas the firſt Author of this miſsion, nor I knovve not for certaine, vvhy vve vvere choſen for this miſsiō abovve the reſt. Theſe are his vvordes, by this you may perceaue, vvhat an authenticall miſsion and comiſsion this vvas.* Hitherto the Apologiſt. Nay rather you may vievv and behold vvhat fraude and Coſeninge he vſeth, to backbite thoſe good Prieſtes, and to abuſe and deceiue his readers. Fol. 132.

For ſuppreſſinge vvilfully D. By: his anſvvere vnto thoſe queſtions, *VVho ſent him? and vvith vvhat authority?* he choppeth in his anſvvere vnto an other particular demaunde to vvitt, vvho vvas the firſt author of that miſſion? vnto vvhich, the Doctors anſvveare is direct, that he knevve not vvho vvas the firſt man, that moued that miſſion. Theſe Queſtions vvere much vrged, becauſe they thought they had great aduantage againſt them, for that they vvanted à Princes letter of Credence for their meſſage, and brought the Prieſtes teſtimonyes in ſmale peieces of Paper.

Vnto all vvhich D. Bysh: anſvvered in particular, and kepeth à copie of it. The vvhich I haue gotten to ſett dovvne in this

place, that you may more liuely discouer the paltry dealinge of this Apologist. vvho vvantinge subiect of iust reproofe vvould needs forge and coyne some. To those Questions then, vvho sent them, and vvith vvhat authority, this vvas the Doctors answere. There vvas not in England eyther „ Prince, or Catholike Magistrate, to giue „ vs any Customary letters of Credence. „ Nor any noble lay Cath: could vvrite for „ vs to his holines, vvithout imminent dā- „ ger of his liberty and life. And vve ha- „ ue no other Ecclesiasticall Prelate, Besi- „ des M. Archp: vvho neither vvas confir- „ med in that authoritye, nor vvas it to be „ expected, that he should vvrite in our co- „ mendation. Knovvinge full vvell, that „ vve vvent about the moderation off his „ povver. VVhom neuertheless vve gaue „ to Vnderstand of our enterprise, and he „ vvouldnot prohibite it. vve bringe vvith „ vs the humble petitions off nine and „ tvventy learned and vertuous Priestes, „ vvhich vvere for the most part addressed „ vnto his holines in forme of supplica- „ tion. Seauen of the auncienteſt of them, „ comitted the charge of presentinge off „ them vnto vs, as their letters do beare „ vvitnesse. Neither are simale peeces off „ Paper brought out of an yland, vvhere „ most norrovve search is made at euery

„ porte, to be ſmally eſteemed: vvhich off
„ purpoſe vve made choiſe of, for the ſaf-
„ ter conveiance: miſdoubtinge nothinge
„ leſſe then that the vertue of a teſtimony,
„ should lye in the largeneſſe of the Pa-
„ per, vvherin it vvas vvritten. Aſſone as
„ vve came into à Catholike country, vve
„ got letters of commendations, from the
„ right R. Byshope of Paris, in the name al-
„ ſo of Card: Gondy his vncle, vnto Card:
„ Aldibrandino his holines nephevve.
„ Thus furnished vve came, preſumminge
„ that his hol: graue vviſedome and expe-
„ rience, vvould not ſtand vpon ſuch for-
„ malityes vvithvs cominge out of a coun-
„ try, vvhere vvas neither magiſtrate nor
„ Notary Catholike. Neither vvere the
„ humble requeſtes of fevver Prieſtes then
„ they, to be contemned: conſideringe
„ vvith vvhat perill of their liues, and vvith
„ hovve ſmale vvorldly recompence, they
„ had à longe tyme laboured in our bleſ-
„ ſed lordes vineyard. Principally vvhen
„ ſome of them vvere of the moſt Ancient,
„ beſt qualified, and beſt eſteemed Prieſtes
„ of England.

Thus farr his anſvvere, vvhich you ſee to haue been ſome, thinge els, then NESCIO QVIS FVERIT PRIMVS AVTHOR. And this might the Apol: haue ſett dovvne as vvell as the other, & should in honeſty

haue done it, bicause it vvas the direct answere; but it vvould not fitt his purpose, vvhich vvas to depraue and calumniate, but not to tell the trueth.

Of these Questions, vvith their answeres I collect and gather tvvo thinges. First that it is à palpable vntrueth that D.By: beinge demaunded hovve many Priestes he knevve of his party in England, should answere that he knevve but tvvelue, as the Apo: affirmeth: vvheras you see by his last answere, that they had 9. suffrages for them: besides their ovvne tvvo, and sondry others, both in and out of England, vvhom he knevve to fauour their party, although they feared to set their handes to it.

fol: 131.

Secondy by these and such like ioly Questions, is iustyfied that vvhich D. By: sayd in his letter, that many vaine impertinent Questions vvere asked them: as for example, vvas it not fond, to demaund of them, vvhom they knevve to enter into a matter longe after others, vvho vvas the very first that motioned it? but it passeth all vvisedome and folly, to ask messengers vpon their oathes, vvhy choise vvas made off them, before all others, for that message: as though they could enter in to the secretes of other mens hartes, and did se their hidden counsailes. yf no Princes Ambassadors comission, should be allovved, before they

had reſolued thoſe tvvo Queſtions, *VVho vvas he that made the firſt motion af that imbaſſade: and vvhy they vvere choſen abovve all others in the realme to performe it.* I vvene vve should haue fevve Ambaſſadors or agentes admitted any vvhere. Theſe and ſuch like peeuish interrogatoryes D. By : taxed vpon great reaſon. And did not vvrite (as the Apol: falſely chargeth him,) that hevvas not examined at all, vpon any ſubſtantiall pointe of their meſſage: but heſaid that thoſe materiall pointes vvere barely and nakedlv taken vvithout there proofes and perſuaſions: yea vvere often vvreſted and peruerted. See his ovvne vvordes. Let vs goe on toavvhile, and heare vvhat the Apologiſt hath more to obiect againſt him. Mary [ſaith he] thoſe tvvo meſſengers ſeemed ſcarſly agreed in the cauſe off their comminge. For M. Charnock did ſay and ſvveare (orels the Apol: lyeth) that their onely comminge vvas, eyther to haue the Archpr : Changed, or yf he vvere already confirmed to haue ſome other order appointed vvith him. D. By : enlargeth him ſelf vnto ſix cauſes. *The firſt vvas deuotion to ſee the holy places. The ſecond, to haue Byshops, the third, yf that vvould not be graunted, then that the povver to confirme and conſecrate oyles, might begiuen vnto ſome of the Anncienteſt Prieſtes. 4. that their ſodality might be con-*

Copie of diſ: Pag: 171.

Fol: 131.

firmed, 5. that order might be taken to compose all matters in vvisbich, 6. about the like order for the Colledges. They had not then so litle to say as F. Per: in his letter (*pag: 58,*) affirmeth of them. In all vvhich there is scantly one [as the Apol: avverreth] vvhich concurneth fully, vvith his felovves petitiō. Novve I pray thee (good Reader) iudg, vvhether yf Byshops had bin granted, (vvhich is D. By: second cause,) Mr. Archp: must not haue been chaunged, or els some other order appointed vvith him, vvhich vvas M. Charnock onely petition, as this false cōpanion blusseth not to affirme here: and yet in the very next leafe, forgettinge him self, he bringeth M. Char: in sainge that amonge other thinges, he came to demande, that noe such bookes should hereafter be vvritten by Catholikes, vvhich vvere like to exasperate the state. Oh hovve necessary a thinge it is, for à lyar [as the prouerbe goeth] to haue à good memorye, othervvise he may sone shame him selfe: as yon see here by this Apologist, vvho in the next leaues, Bringeth in one man speekinge contradictoryes. But pardon him I pray you, for it vvas for à good end. For vvhat good end must he needs lye in that sorte? Mary to proue those tvvo Messengers to haue disaggreed in their matters. For M: Charnock vvould haue such boo-

kes prohibited. But D. By. did not like that pointe. Yf they agreed in the other more materiall pointes, it imported the leſſe. But D. By: beinge aſked about that, ſaith that he remembreth not, that he vvas examined thereon, nor knovveth not vvhy he should. But in priuate talke he might haue ſaid, that he knevve ſome in England vvho liked of that booke of titles, becauſe it opened very particularly the ſtate of that high Queſtion. For that pointe [he ſaith] the booke vvas liked, but for many other reſpectes, he affirmeth it to bee much misliked, and chiefely for tvvo of very greate vveight. VVherof one is in the former parte of that diſcourſe, of the peoples povver ouer their Princes, vvhich if it be not very vvarely read and diſcreetly vnderstood, is a moſt perillous and peſtiferous peece of doctrine. The other tovvardes the end of the later: VVhere his lavvier hauinge argued at large of ſeauen or eight ſeuerall houſes, pretendinge right to the crovvne after her maieſtye, & [like a good contry man] blemished moſt of them borne vvith in the realme, vvith baſtardye, he neuertheles concludeth very grauely, and like à ſound lavvier, I vvarrant you. That euerye on of their titles is good in lavve: And vvarranteth on his credite, ech pretendor, that he may rightofully put him

selfe in armes, & call his friends about him, to porsue his interest. A paradox; and very strange assertion, that so many seuerall pretēdors, to one and the same thinge, can ech one haue lawfull title to the whole. And yf after his holy counsell, so many should push at the crowne with all their forces, (as who will not giue the venture for a kingedome, hauinge iust claine to it,) it would sett all England together by the eares, and the whole country in combustion. Which perauenture, Might be part of his meaninge, who made that treatise, that whiles they within the realme, were bickeringe one with another, some stranger might stepp in, and conquer them all. Those pointes thē, as, I said with some other D. By: vtterly, misliketh. and touchinge other bookes against the state, [as that vnpure and loathsome one of leysters common weale, and that malepert and railinge one of And: plilopari is, with such like] he doth vpon mature consideration of that matter, greatly disalowe off them. As bookes wholy vnnecessary, and wherin to smale purpose, much folish passion and splene is vttered against some mighty personages, who thereby beinge highly offended do wourke our Catholike bretherne that liue vnder them in England greete woe. Wherfore he taketh it

for

for an intolerable ouerſight, to publish ſo farr out of ſeaſon, ſuch ſatiricall inuectiues.

Nowe one word (before I make a-uend) of D. By: his anſwere vnto the Comiſſarye enquiringe of him, what he knewe of the man who wrote the letter off preſidences. It was that he was ſo farr from knowinge the Author of it, that he had neuer before, heard one worde off that matter. But ſuppoſed it to haue been framed by their aduerſaryes to worke their diſgrace: and that the letters wherwith it was ſayd to be ſubſcribed, agreed vnto Mr. Archp: as well to him: For that copy was shewed him in Latin to which F. Par: ſayd his name was ſubſcribed. And ſo might as well be Georgius Blackw: as Guil: Bysh: then F. Per: replied that is was on M: Watſons letter: yet he had before (contrary to his owne knowledg) charged D. By: with it. Note his tender conſcięce. after he demaunded of D. Byshope whether he knewe M. Watſon or what he had heard of him: to which the d: anſwere was farr other wiſe then this Apologiſt reporteth. to witt, that he had L. 139.
heard exceedinge well of one Mr. w: Watſon prieſt, howe he had many yeares very fruitfully trauailed in his vocatiō, reducinge diuerſe vnto the Cath: faith, &

by the assistance of God his grace had caused 25. Aulters to be erected to the singular seruice of our blessed Sauiour. VVhich fewe in Englād had (as he thought) done besides him: Sorie I am that to some blemish of his former vertues, certayne bookes sett out of late, cary the letrers off his name. Because the style seemeth to sharpe, and some thinge in them soundeth harshly in sondry Catholike eares. But to mytigate the matter, the occasion of vvrittinge, vvhich tyme and place ministred must be duly considered, and vvithall howe he & others vvere before grieuously hurte in their reputation by the other party; and that in defence of their iust honour, they might lavvfully Discredite the iniurious aggressors. but of this, some other tyme, more at large; to drawe nowe vnto the vvindinge vp of this matter concerninge M. D. Byshope, finally the Apol: saith, that the Messengers duringe the tyme off their restrainte had all maner of iustice offred them for their defence: and after their deliuerance vvere bidden to followe their matters, &c. For answvere vnto this faire tale, see vvhat is sayd in M. D. By. letter and in the censure vpon F. Per. letter, I vvill here repete most Briefly and most truly, howe they vvere vsed, and leaue the iudgment of it, vnto the reader: beinge

both apprehended, all their letters and inſtructions vvere taken avvay from them, & they vvere kept cloſe priſoners apart, ſo that one could haue no helpe off the other. Yea vvere ſeuerally examined to try yf they could drawve out of one, that vvhich might hurt thother. their aduerſaryes vvere their kepers, examiners, and iudges, not alovvinge them any helpe of counſaile, ſo much as of one another. And by interrogatoryes (ſuch as it pleaſed them to propound) they vvere cõpelled to deliuer the meſſage they vvere ſent about. Thus ſtood the caſe vvith them vvhyles they vvere in durance: neither goeth the Apol: about to confute any of theſe particularites. Then before they vvere deliuered, they had ſentence to depart the city vvithin ten dayes, vvhich reſpite they obtayned to viſite the holy places. One beinge enlarged, thother vvas kept ſtyll in the Colledg ſafe, as it vvere in hoſtage off the others good behauiour abrode. And not thinkinge that enough, for more ſuerty they lodged the Doctor enlarged vvith D. Haddocke and M. Aray, that they might looke vnto him for dealinge vvith any body. All this is ſo certayne, that noe one iote of it can vvith any honeſty be denied. novve lett the vpright reader determine, both of the forme of iu-

stice held within the Colledg, and what possibility there was after, to seeke for redresse.

This is that I had to say touchinge those pointes, wherewith M. D. Byshope standeth charged in the Apology. And [as hath been shewed] looke howe many charges, and assaultes so many eyther apparant falshoodes or couert guyles and deceites, to infect the vnwary and credulous reader, with errour and euill opinio of him vndeseruedly.

What good Christian, would not wonder to see men esteemed other wise neither folish nor dishonest, so to forgett them selues in their owne cause, that they seeme, duringe the moode and humour, eyther to haue lost their wittes, or to haue cast aside all honesty. Howe could they els contrary to their owne knowledge, so misreporte, disguyse, and peruert other mens sayinges and doeinges, and so contradicte them selues, which are certayne signes of voluntary blindnes.

And yf the Author of this Apologye by longe custome of canuassinge and wranglinge, or that his iudgmēt in his elder yeares beginneth to faile him, doe soe grossely ouersee, and ouersute him selfe. Yet [I hope] that you whom he tearmeth the vnited cleargy of England, (for that you

belike ioyne vnder his enſigne) remembringe the holy honour of your coate and callinge, vvill not any longer endure to be made ſuch baſe vnderlinges, as to ſuffer that deceitefull vvourkemā, vnder the pretexte of your names, to diſgrace and bringe in contempt our vvhole order. VVherfore (deere bretherne) take harte and courage: Diſavovve, and diſclaime boldly from all ſuch lyeinge, ſtaunderous and vvicked libels: pull of your maskes, from other mens faces; teach them hereafter ſo much good mamers at the leſt, as eyther to aſke you leaue firſt, and make you acquainted vvith vvhat they vvrite, or els hardly to ſpeake in their ovvne Perſons. Othervviſe by your ſilence, (as you beſt knovve) you ratifyeinge and confirminge their factes, are made partakers of their faultes. And ſo conſequently you ſtand deepely charged and your conſciēces deadly vvoun ded vvith that hainous crime of backbitinge and infaminge your felovve labourers in our lordes vineyard, to the greate ſcandale of the vvorld, and exceedinge hinderance off the Catholike cauſe. Our bleſſed Sauiour giue you grace to looke to it in tyme, and to amend it.



AN ANSVVERE MADE BY ME CHARLES PAGET ESQVIER, TO certayne vntruthes and falſi-tyes, tochinge my ſelfe, con-tayned in a booke, intitled a briefe Apologie or defence, of the Catholicke Hierarchie & ſubordination in Englan-ce, & cet.

IT is not longe ſince that Iſa-vve your booke intitled a briefe Apologye or defence of the Catholicke Hierar-chye and ſubordination in Englande, & cet. VVherin you treate off manye matters, name manye perſons, and

enterlace and mingle the one vvith the other, in ſuch diſorderlye and confuſed maner, as one may eaſlye ſee that your meaninge is not to make appeare to the vvorlde, vvhat is the veritye: but thinke you haue gayned much, yf by your obſcure and darke narration you may colour and couer the defects, errors, and faultes, that iuſtlye are to be imputed to you and your aſſociats and dravve men to doubt yf not to condemne the ſincere and honeſt proceedinge of thoſe you eſteeme the contrarye part. Hovv abſurdlye you haue behaued your ſelf concerninge the matters and perſons of others you vvrite of, I refer you to their ansvvers: but hovv vncharitablye, and levvdly you haue gouerned your ſelf tovvards me, is to be ſeeue by that I ſhall ſet dovvne in this my defence.

In the 3 leafe of your booke after you haue ſayd that in the yeare 1578. the contentiō began betvvene doctor levvis late bishop of Caſſano and the English ſcholers at Rome & cet: and that the ſame vvas nourriſhed by ſome ſpies ſent from the counſell of englande, namelye vaughan and Aldrid & cet. and vvithal the counſell of englande endeuored by all meanes poſsible, to maintaine ſuſpition, ielouſye, and emulation, betvvene thoſe that fauored doctor levvis on the one ſide, and the reſt that vvere ioyned vvith doctor Allen and the Ieſuiſtes on the other, thoughe much no doubt a-

gainſt both their vvills. Then you ſay that that attempt of thers vvas holpen ſoone after by a nevv accident that fell out in paris in the yeare 1583. and 1584. vvher tvvo or three lay gentilmen belonginge (as vvas ſayd) to the Quene of ſcots, then priſoner in Englande, fallinge to be diſcontented vvith doctor Allen, F. parſons, Sir Frauncis Engleſielde, and others vnited together in the affaires of our countrye, theſe gentilmen partinge them ſelues and their actions from them, and goinge by an other vvay: increaſed the foreſaid breache, and made a farre ſtranger oppoſition againſt the foreſaid men, and vvhole bodye of Catholikes ioyned vvith them at home and abroade: vvherof manye great inconueniences did inſue, and amonge others as the vvorlde doth knovve the ouerthrovve at lenght of the Quene her ſelf and manye more of her frendes: as more particularlye ſhalbe shevved vvhen it cometh forth in our larger apologie.

Theſe be your ovvne vvordes. Vpon the margent you name my celf, maſter Thomas Morgen, and maſter Thomas Throckmarton, as the three foreſaid perſons you ſpeake of.

By this ſpeache of yours you taxe me vvith tvvo thinges: the firſt is that vvheras ther vvas a breache betvvene doctor levvis and his partye, and doctor Allen, F. perſons, Sir Frauncis Engleſield vvith them of the other partye, that I vvas one of thoſe, that increaſed the ſame and made a ſtronger op-

poſition againſt doctor Allen and his partye then vvas before. The ſecond point is that by the meanes therof did inſue manye inconueniences, and amonge the reſt the ouerthrovv of the Quene of ſcotlande, and manye more of her frendes. For the proofe ether of the one or the other: ther is nether teſtimonie, vvritinge, or probabilitye layd dovvne or brought forthe: *But you ſay all the vvorlde knovveth it, and more particularlye it shalbe shevved (yf neede require) in your larger apologye vvhen it cometh forthe.*

For anſvuere hereof I am to tell you, that in that vvhich concerneth the defacinge of one his credit and reputation, you are to alledge informations, arguments, and coniectures of true dedes, or at leaſt verye likelye: and that may properlye be termed a iuſt accuſation. But vvhen nether vvitnes nor proofe appereth, as ther doth not in this caſe of mine: then is it rightlye to be eſteamed and called Calumnye. But you ſay all the vvorlde knovveth it. I vvoulde fayne knovv vvhat vvorlde you meane. And yf you take the vvorlde for thoſe that be in Englande: they knovv I vvas attainted of highe treaſon, and that my liuinge vvas confiſcated to the Quenes maieſtie her vſe of england, for that I vvas helde ouermuch deuoted and affected to the aduauncement of the Quene of ſcotlandes

affaires. Beſides the ſaid Quene of ſcotlande the night before her death gaue in chardge to diuerſe of her ſeruants to recomende me to her embaſſadour in Paris, and to the Princes and peeres of her bludde in Fraunce and ells vvher: vvhich are redye to teſtifye the Same. And nether the one, nor the other of theſe thinges vvoulde haue bene done, yf the ouerthrovve of the Said Quene of ſcotlande, had inſued by my meanes: as indirectly you do infer, or vvoulde putſome buſſez in mens braines at leaſt to doubt therof. And to helpe this forvvarde you adde that yf neede require (as thoughe you had ſayd ſomvvhat to the purpoſe vvhen ther is nothinge in dede) it shalbe more paticularlye ſet dovvne in a larger apologye, vvhen it cometh forthe: bythis it may be ſeene that you preſume verye far of your credit: that onlye vpon your bare vvorde you thinke, that vntill your larger apologye come forthe thoſe vvhich reede this calumnye of yours, vvill holde it for a veritye. You shall do vvell to make haſt to publishe your ſaid latter apologye vvith proofes: vvhich you shall neuer be able todo: and to put to your name for the iuſtifienge vvhat you vvrite, as I do mine to this here. Othervviſe I am ſure that all honeſt vviſe and indiferent men vvillmake no accompte of vvhat you ſay, and eſteeme

you as a detractor. In the meane vvhile vntill you haue vttered better ſtuffe then yet you haue done, for the reprehendinge of my dealinges and actions in Fraunce, it is not vvorth the loking on and much leſſe vvorthye anye credit.

In the 5. Leafe and yeare 1589. you ſay priour Arnauld vvas ſent to Spayne to diſcredit the Cardinall Allen vvith the kinge of Spayne, and to ſet vp his emulator againſt him in the ſame dignitye vvhile he liued & ſet.

It folovveth not that Doctor levvis vvas Doctor Allens emulator, yf he had ſought to be Cardinall, or thoſe that shoulde aſſiſt him in that courſe should be counted factious, as you vvould haue men to thinke, ſince his good partes did merit the dignitye for as ther be of Frenche, Italiens, and of other nations diuers of one nation that be Cardinalls, and yet they be not eſteamed emulators one againſt an other: ſo vvith any charitable interpretation may ther be the like in our Englishe nation. But in truth I vvas nether priuye nor knevv of that priors goinge into ſpayne, or vvhat he negotiated ther. So that your naminge me in the margent, as one to be touched herevvith is of no force, and a manifeſt vntruthe.

In the 6. leafe and yeare 1594. you ſay they began in Flaunders againſt Father vvilliam holt an Englishe Ieſuiſt (in great credit vvith the

Gouernours ther) and maſter Hughe ovven conioyned vvith him, vnder pretence that they vvere partiall, and furthered not thoſe of that faction, in their penſions, and other ſuites by them pretended. & cet. in the margent you ſet dovvne maſter Charles Pagets letters and memorialls yet extant: by the vvhich you vvould haue it thought that I vvas the principall cauſe therof.

True it is that the ſaid Ovven vvas called in queſtion, by the count de fuentes then Gouernour of the lovve countryes for the kinge of ſpayne, (and as I haue harde by the ſollicitation of Father Creton a Scottish Ieſuiſt) for ſome diſſeruices he had done to the ſaid kinge, (vvherof as I heare he is not yet purged) tvvo Commiſſioners, one Monſieur Martin and one other, Counſellors of Macklin vvere appointed by the ſayd count to examine not onlye Ovven of his vndevvtifull behauyour tovvards the ſaid kinge, but alſo had authoritye to force anye they vvoulde by iuſtice, to ſay vpon their oathes, vvhat they coulde to ſuch articles, as vvere to be miniſtred to them, by the ſaid commiſſioners. The late Earle of vveſt merlande, Sir Thimothye Moket, maſter VVilliam Treſame, maſter Pansfote, maſter Ligon, maſter Stonor, maſter Broune, maſter Gage, and my ſelf vvith diuers others, (vvherof ſome vvere reuerende Preiſtes) vvere ſummoned by iuſtice to ap-

peare afore the ſaid commiſſioners, before vvhome vve vvere examined. VVe ansvvered ſincerlye and trulye vpon our oathes to that vve vvere demanded of. Father Holt VVent to the ſaid Martin and tolde him, that he vvas not to geaue credit vnto vs, for that vve vvere men tranſported vvith paſſion and partialitye. VVe the ſaid noble men and gentilmen vnderſtandinge of his ſaid information geuen againſt vs, and that he meant to deface vs as men that vvere corrupted, and reſpected not our oathes: complayned of him to father Oranus his Superiour: deſiringe to haue ſatisfaction of him for it. His ſaid Superiour charged the ſaid. F. holt vvith it. He denied it. And ſaid he vvas ſo far from doinge anye ſuch thinge as he neuer ſavve the ſaid Martin in fine proufe vvas made that he had bene vvith the Said Martin in forme aforeſaid. VVhere vpon his Superiour vvilled him to declare the truthe vpon his obedience. (And as I haue bene crediblye informed) then the ſaid. F. holt ansvvered, that it vvas true that he had bene vvith the ſaid Martin as is afore reherſed: but vvith intention, his Superiour ſhoulde not knovv of it. His Superiour beinge iuſtlye offended vvith his equiuocatinge ansvvere, vvorthelye) as I haue harde enioyned him a good penaunce forthe

ſame

ſame. And both for this his irreligious behauiour tovvards vs, and manye other foule and moſt vnſeamlye partes played vvith vs in generall, and vvith euerye one of vs in particular: beinge the cheife and only cauſe of our diſunion and ſeperation, vvho vvere afore in charitye and vnitye one vvith an other: vve the abouesaid vvith manye more (and not I alone as youvvould haue men thinke) did preſent diuers articles: vvher in (as I remembre) vve shevved that he vvas of a rude and inſolent nature, ſubiect to paſſion in the higheſt degree: verye inciuill in his behauiour, verye credulous of falſe reports, very ſuſpitions in his conceipts, verye obſtinat in his opinion, partiall in preſentinge, and aduauncinge of pretences to the Gouernours: that he nourrished faction and deuiſion, and vvas chefe head of the ſame. That he vvas diſdainfull and of a commandinge humor, that he vvas improper to giue or take counſell: eaſye to breake amitye, and readye to take reuenge: and in fine vvas incompatible to liue vvithall. All vvhich thinges vvere ſo true, as euen ſome that loued him verye vvel much miſliked him for the ſame. And theſe errors did vve finde in him by experience: hovv ſoeuer you comende the ſaid F. Holt for his modeſtye and mildnes.

I can aſſure you thatvvhen theſe differences aforeſaid, vvere afore Seigneur Babtiſta de Taſſis (novv Spanis Embaſſador in Fraunce) and Father Oliuerus Ieſuiſt apointed by the Archduke Albert to heare them: F. Oliuerus ſaid to ſome of his frendes in conference, that vve the ſayd noble men and gentilmen, that bare the ſvvorde, vvere more mete to be churche men, for our quiet and temperat behauiour, then F. holt and his aſſociats; vvho proceaded vvith great paſſion and coler, vvhich I repeate to shevv the error of your opinion touchinge Father Holt.

And vvhen by your larger apologie (vvhich doubtles vvilbe ſome bulbegger to feare children vvithall becauſe almoſt in euerye leafe you threaten vs vvith the ſame) you shall further vrge vvhat is reherſed of the ſaid Father holt, then shall it be ſeene vvhat proufes and probabilityes vvere of theſe thinges obiected againſt him, as alſo shalbe ſet dovvne his malicious dealinges againſt the lorde Dacres, the lord Paget my brother, maſter Bridgvvater, maſter Couert Preſtes: Late maſter Thomas Throckmarton, maſter Godfrey Fouliambe, maſter Broune, maſter Gage, maſter Thomas Morgē vvith diuers others and my ſelfe: vvhich novv for breuityes ſake I let paſſe. as alſo I vvould haue it appeare hovv loath I am

to diſcouer his turpitude and vnſauorye dealinge novv he is dead ; Vnleſt you or ſome of your faction force me ther vnto, for the defence of the noble men and gentilmens reputations;and mine ovvne, you ſeake ſo much to ſtaine and blemish.

Onlye at this preſent for that vvhich concerneth this point, I ſhall pray thoſe vvhich be free from partialitye, to conſider the qualityes of theſe noble men and Gentilmen aforeſaid: their ſufficientye, the cauſe they endure for, their conſtancye therin, the loſſes they haue had for the ſame:their longe exille vvith manye comendable partes that be in them : and let them Iudge from vvhence theſe broyles and ſturres did ſpringe, v vhat ſeruice f.holt did for the aduauncinge of the comen cauſe, and vvhat good to his ſocietye, vvhen as vvith his ſayd imperfections he diſguſted the ſayd noble men and gentilmen & ioyned moſt intrinſically vvith maſter Hughe Ovven, George Herbert an Inkeper, George perſons a black smith his ſon, Daniell an apoſtat, tipins a double ſpye, George Stoker an ordinarry ſeruinge man, Rouland alias verſtegan a coupers ſon, vvith ſuch like, v vho v vere the famous Bodyé of the Catholickes in Flaunders on f.perſons ſide, that you ſo much vaunt of. and vvho in deede vvere of. F. holts priuye counſell, and moſt em-

ployed by him for his intelligences, and in all affayres of eſtate, vvhich haue ſucceded accordinglye.

. *In the leafe 26. and the yeare 1586. and 87. you ſay that a tempeſt being paſt ouer amonge the Schollers and the Jeſuiſts at Rome. & cet. vvith an other of the ſame kinde in Flaunders, vvherof are extant moſt paſsionat memorials and iniurious letters vvritten and exhibited to diuers Princes: and amonge other to his holines him ſelf for the defacinge the ſaid fathers, and their vvhole order by ſome English ther, vvho in like maner both fauored and foſtered the Roman tumults, (of vvhich memorialls and letters vve haue ſeene a Latin treatiſe or collection of aboue a Dozen sheets of Paper vvhich vve reſerue to our larger Apologye) ther vvere diuers others ſet on to ſpread about in Englande at the ſame time, or ſoone after manye infamous and opprobrious reports againſt the ſame religious men, partlye paſſed in Rome, and Flaunders, and partlye other vvher: but all tendinge to their infamy and discredit, vvherof no one of moment vvas eyther true or probable. In the margent you set dovvne the treatiſe intitled* Acta & ſcripta calumnioſa. *D. G. Giff. D. H. Griff. C. Pag.* aliorúmque contra Presb. ſocietat. anno 1591. *As though Doctor Gifforde, Doctor Griffith and my ſelf vvere the deuiſers, preſēterors and publishers, of theſe memorialls and letters, you ſpeake off.*

I do verye vvell remembre that father

perſons (vvho I haue greate cauſe to ſuſpect to be the author of this libell vvhich I may call ſo becauſe it is vvithout a name and full of lyes) by his letters ſent to me at Bruxelles, in the lovv countryes, did challenge Maſter Doctor Gifforde and me to be the inuentors of the ſaid memorialls, and preſentors of them to his holines, and only of his ovvne imagination vvithout grovvnde, for anythinge concerninge me by his ſpeaches, and letters, he bruited both Maſter Doctor Gifforde and me, to be not only the authors of the ſaid memorials but alſo of the ſturres of the English Colledge at Rome. And not vvithſtandinge I did then aſſure F. perſons by my letters that I neuer inuented nor preſented the ſayd memorialls nor any ells to his holines, nor to any other againſt the Ieſuiſts, nor had to deale vvith the ſturres in the English Colledge at Rome, yet did he procure a commiſſion from his holines to the bishop of Tricaria nuntio in the lovv countryes, (a very vviſe and vertuous prelate) that for the triall of the truth hereof, both Maſter Doctor Gifforde, and my ſelfe, should be examined. Father Baldvvin had ample authoritye from the general of the Ieſuiſts, and F. perſons, to pourſue vs, or accord vvith vs, for the bodye of the vvhole ſocietye, and for F. Perſons: the ſaid F. Bald.

vvin preſented fishers Papers, and examinations you ſpeake of, vvithall thinges he coulde deuiſe or imagine, to proue Maſter Doctor Gifforde and my ſelfe to be the inuentors of the ſaid memorialls, and cheafe inſtruments of the broyles amonge the Scollers at Rome. VVe vvere ſent for by the ſaid nuntio vve appeared. For my ſelf the nuntio vſed ſome ſpeaches vvith me to accorde vvith. F. Perſons: vvhich I offred to do, ſo as he vvould geaue me that ſatisfaction, that reaſon and conſcience bounde him vnto. But nether then, nor ſince to this houre, vvas ther eyther accuſation off fisher, or any other, by vvorde or vvritinge obiected againſt me, to proue me to haue knovven of the ſaid memorialls, or to haue meddled vvith the broyles off the English Colledge at Rome. VVhich F. Perſons vvith his lienge affermatiõs vvoulde nedes face me out vvas ſo. The matter being ſo cleare on my ſide the Nuntio neuer ſpake to me of it againe. But prayed me to be a meane that ſome good ende might be made betvvene Maſter Doctor Gifforde, and F. Perſons. F. Baldvvin vrged as much as he could Maſter Doctor Gifforde to giue ſome ſatisfaction, he vtterlye denied it, and ſayd ther vvas no cauſe: and vvished for the clearinge of all doubtes that F. Baldvvin vvould proceade by or-

der of iuſtice againſt him: and then vvhoſoeuer vvere founde culpable should be forced to giue ſatisfaction. F. Baldvvin vvould in no vviſe harken to this courſe: for that in lavv ther muſt be an accuſer againſt Maſter Doctor Gifforde, vvho yf he coulde not make his allegations good, vvas to receaue the ſame punishment, and shame, as the ſaid Doctor should haue done, yf he had bene founde culpable. It is euident that vvhat F. Baldvvin vvas to ſay and alledge vvas of no ſubſtance againſt Maſter Doctor Gifforde: or ells he vvould not haue refuſed to haue proceeded by the courſe of Iuſtice. VVhich aduauntage comenly he and ſome of our English Ieſuiſts do not vſe to let slippe and ſpecially e the broyllers, vvhen it is for matter of reuenge. To be short as the ſaid nuntio tolde me him ſelfe, F. Baldvvin deſired that thoſe differences betvvene Maſter Doctor Gifforde and the Ieſuiſts might be ended. VVherupon they both beinge vvith him, he ſittinge in his chaire and they ſtanding, he tooke one hande of eche of them, and helde them faſt together, F. Baldvvin and the ſaid Doctor ſtoupinge dovvne together, the ſaid father began and ſayd to this effect: that yf eyther the Ieſuiſts or F. Perſons had any vvay offended Doctor Gifford that in their names he did aske them

forgiuenes, and afterwvard the ſayd Doctor in like maner repeted the like vvordes in effect, that the ſayd father had vſed: and ſayd that yf he had offended the Ieſuiſts, or F. Parſons, that he asked them forgiuenes, and ſo they parted good frendes, both promiſinge before the ſayd Nuntio, that the accorde should be published, but the maner therof kept ſecret, and (as I remẽbre) he tolde me likevviſe, that in their preſences the Sayd Papers and vvritinges vvere burnt, or to be burnt afterwvards: vvhich vvas done to the ende theſe thinges should neuer be ſpoken of againe. The Sayd Nuntio vvrote in particular to Cardinall Cayetan then protector of our nation, hovv theſe matters paſſed, and vvere accorded. F. Perſons got a copye of the ſaid letter, and vvrote to one (as I remembre) in dovvay, that Maſter Doctor Gifforde had asked the Ieſuiſts forgeuenes vpon his knees, and Sayd Nothinge, hovv F. Baldvvin Began in forme a foreſaid: but leaueth it out, knovving it vvould haue bene to his disaduauntage. In this you may ſee he left out that vvhich vvas againſt the Ieſuiſts, vvhich cleane changeth the matter And by his ſeditious report, he vvas the cauſe of a nevv breache: And yf he had tolde the truthe in the vvhole, then should it haue bene founde, that, F. Baldvvin had

bene

bene ihe ſeaker and beginner of this accor-de. And ſo F. perſous had had no cauſe to triumphe againſt Maſter Doctor Gifforde, as he did. But rather the ſaid Doctor a-gainſt him. It is vvell knovven that this is not the firſt time that. F. Perſons hath v-ſed theſe trikes, as in addinge, deminishin-ge, equiuocatinge, vſinge of ſubintelligi-turs, yea and yf neede be flatlye to lye, ſo as it may ſerue his turne. All vvhich narra-tion of theſe thinges I haue made becauſe one may ſee, that you rather diſcouer your malice, then aduaunce your pretence, in ſpeakinge of the foreſaid memorialls and letters: as alſo of fishers papers and depo-ſitions, vvhich you ſay be reſerued, vvhen as by the ſayd Nuntio they vvere con-demned to the fire, not vvorthye after euer to be remembred.

You ſay fisher vvas very repentant for the offences he had committed, and confeſſed of him ſelf frelye ſuch matters, as you alled-ge from him againſt me and others, but I ſay yf he be free from feare of punishment, and came face to face before them he hath accuſed, he vvoulde for the diſchardge of his conſcience, (at leaſt yf he be a good Chriſtian) acquite them of the moſt prin-cipall poynts you take moſt aduauntage of, becauſe they be falſe, and excuſe him ſelf by the rigour and roughnes you cauſed to

be vſed to vvards him, vvhich maketh many times men of vveake ſpirits and courage to ſay vvhit is black. And for that concerneth me, I do not ſo far dispaire of the acknovvleginge of his errors and faultes, but that yf I might ſpeake vvith him afore indifferent perſons, I vvould make him lay dovvne the truthe of the speaches and actions (vvhich vvere verye fevv) that paſſed betvvene him and me, and to shevv that they vvere nothinge in that ſort, and ſence, you giue them out, but vvere verye vvell to be iuſtified afore God, and man, and tendinge to no other ende, but to the aduancement of gods cauſe, and reformation of ſuch as hinder the ſame.

And vvher as you reherſe diuers peces off letters of the Cardinall allens and others in the leafes 36. 37. 86. 87. 88. vvherby you vvould make men to thinke that Maſter Doctor gifforde, Maſter Thomas Throckmarton, and my ſelf, vvere in faction againſt the ſaid Cardinall, (all vvhich letters yf they be vvell examined, proue nothinge to the purpoſe) it is vvel knovven that the ſaid Cardinall did ſo eſteeme of Doctor Gifforde, for his vertue, learninge, and other ſingular giftes, as vntill his dieng day, he made accompt of him as his ſonne: and vſed him, about him, as for his Theologall, vvhich is a place of honor and con-

fidence, and as for maſter Thomas Throckmarton, he eſteemed him ſo much, for his rare and vertuous partes: as he determined, (yf he had liued) to haue maried him to one of his neces. VVhich shevveth he tooke nether of them in faction againſt him, hovv ſoeuer it pleaſeth you to interpret the ſaid Cardinalls letters contrarye to his meaninge. And put the caſe ther might haue bene ſome ſmall difference in opinions amonge vs about ſome priuat matters, vvhich happeneth manye times betvvene the deareſt frendes, that aftervvarde vvas lapped vp in a louinge and kinde maner: it folovveth not that they be in faction one againſt an other, as you vvoulde haue it.

And as for the conceipt vvhich the ſayd Cardinall had of me, you shall heare out of his letter vvritten vvith his ovvne hande, not longe before his death dated the 16. of Iuly 1594. as folovveth. *Good Maſter Paget, Doctor Gifforde, and Maſter Mushe, tolde you no lye, vvhen they aduertiſed you of mine affection and deſire of your frendship: for ſo it is in deede, and ſo haue I euer thought of your callinge, diſcrete and honorable comportement, that you are vvorthye to be employed, and to ioyne vvith me, or anye other in the ſeruice of our countrye. I neuer had other opinion of you in my life. & cet.*

This letter is of latter date then any I am

ſure you can shevv to the contrarye. And in truth I haue diuers letters vvritten vvith his ovvne hande of latter date then this, that vvitnes the good conceipt he had of me, and the confidence he repoſed in me, by comunicatinge freelye vnto me matters of vveight, vvhich it ſeemed he vvould not haue nether you, nor Father Perſons knovv of: becauſe ther vvas ſome ſtraungnes grovven betvvene him and F. perſons, and as I haue bene crediblye informed, by thoſe vvho vvere moſt intrinſicall vvith the ſaid Cardinall, he began in his latter time to miſlike yours and F. Perſons violent humors in ſuch ſort, as yf he had liued he vvould haue courbed you shorter, for medlinge eyther in matter of ſtate, or in the ſeminaryes, or miſſion of Preeſtes. And this vvas ſeene by his cauſinge F. Creſvvel to be remoued from the gouernement of the English colledge at Rome, vvhoſe in diſcrete and tirannicall behauiour deſerued the ſame. And for the vvhich act, both he, and F. Perſons vſed againſt the ſaid Cardinall amonge their ſecret frendes and folovvers, ſuch vnciuill and irreuerent ſpeaches, as euer after ther vvas but holovv liking betvvene them.

Novv you Maſter Libeller or Father Perſons (becauſe I vvould be ſure to hit rightlye of the author of this libell) I ad-

dreſſe my ſelf to you both, and do aske yon. VVho haue bene the beginners of theſe ſturres and broyles, amonge English Catholickes at home and abroade, hath it not bene you that haue aſſaulted men in their reputations and credits, by cauſinge to be ſpred abroade of them ſlaunderous reports, and calumnyes, for that they vvil not yeelde and ſubiect them ſelues to your obedience and pride? the cheife grovvnd of your exceptions to me, is it not for that your ſelues ſay, I vvould not make you priuye of my courſes and actions? and yf I had dealt in anye matter of practiſe for our countrye beſides you (as I neuer did) but that you vvere the inuentors of the ſame, and the perſvvaders of me therunto, (the more infortunat that I had ſuch directors) vpon vvhat prerogatiue do you chalenge of me that ſlauerye that I muſt deliuer to you my conceits and vvhole courſe of life, by vvhat authoritye do you demaunde it. haue you ſuch commiſſion from his holines? or anye forraine prince, that is to force me to render you accompt, of vvhat I ſpeake or do? I am ſure you hane it not. Or yf you had it, I vvoulde not obay it, no farther then my likinge, for temporall iuriſdiction: for that I ovve in that caſe no obedience but to my ſoueraigne Prince. Yf you demande the ſame in re-

pect you thinke your ſelues to haue a ſu-
perlatiue vviſdome, experience, and pietye
aboue allothers of our nation, you are de-
ceaued, for men ſee that manye off your
practiſes be rashe & vngodlye, and to haue
fayled: And your liues to be full of errors
and imperfections, and are to be amended.
Yf vpon hope off vvorldly preferment,
or profit, their hath bene or perhaps
may be ſome of our nation ſo folishe,
and childishe, that beinge temporall men
do make vovves vnto you in ſuch ſort, as
they haue and vvill vvholye be diſpoſed
of by you, both in ſpirituall and temporall
affaires, and that you haue and do place di-
uers of them in honorable houſes and ells
vvher as your ſpyes to make ſecretlye rela-
tion to you of all that paſſeth in their hou-
ſes, I am not to be brought to that bent,
therfore neuer looke for it, for you shall
neuer haue it. I vvill acknovvledge that
devvtye to my ſoueraigne Prince, & coun-
trye, that I am bounde vnto, that reſpect to
my ſuperiours I ought, that affection to my
parents and frendes they shall deſerue: but
to ſuch as I eſteeme mine enemyes as you
be, that ſeeke to ſpoyle me vniuſtlye of mi-
ne honour and reputation, I am not to be
blamed, yf I ſeperat my ſelf from your cō-
panye and actions. And yf men vvould
but obſerue, as both I and manye haue do-

ne, your ambitious desire of directinge and commādinge both priuat Persons, Prelats, and Princes, and vnlest you obtayne it ther is nothing but vvarre vvith you, they vvould be of my minde and should see that vvhersoeuer you liue, the most of your actions and practises tende to that ende.

I presume in answvere of this, ther shal come nothinge from you but detractions, I vvill say vvith Plato beinge iniured: continue to detract, for hardlye can you speake vvell: and I vvill say vvith Lisander beinge outraged vvith bitter vvordes: vomit boldlye and often your slaunders and calumnyes, & spare not, it may be a meane to emptye your mindes of enuye and malice, vvher vvith they be much infected & posoyned. For mine ovvne part the profit I vvill reape, shalbe to make me more vvarye, and fearfull to fayle, more carefull and diligent to direct my maners, tò cõduct mine actiõs and to reforme and correct mine imperfections, vvhich thinges God graunt in me, and that you may haue repẽtaunce of your faultes past, and a charitable behauiour for the time to come, vvhich is the right and redyest vvay, to procure peace, an quietnes, amonge vs, of euerye one to be desired & embraced.

THE EPISTLE OF THE Author to his frend. M.D.VV.

Right VVorshipfull.

I Haue receaued the Apologie you ſent me as a token of your auncient good vvill continued tovvards me, and a ſigne that you are not forgettfull of me, for the vvich I yeld you moſt hũble thankes, earneſtly requeſting your vvor. to continevve the ſame courtuous good vvill ſtill tovvards him, that vvill not be forgetfull thereof, nor omitt any occaſion to acknovvledge and requite it according to my poore habilitie. And in fevv vvords to tell you the truth, the booke vvas at the firſt vvellcome to me, as nevv thinges ordinarily are to all men But vvhen I had read it ouer, it vtterlye miſliked me, for the cauſes you may ſee in this diſcours annexed. Truth it is, as your vvour conieCtured, I had the other bookes, but not ſent me by any of that faCtion, vvith vvhom I neuer had any dealing or entercourſe of vvriting, but out of Ingland from one

vvho vvith the rest acknovvledged the Archpriest at his first institution. He sent them vpon this occasion.

In August last N.N. (vvho passed by you) hauing occasion to goe into Ingland I dealt vvith him to goe dovvne into my countrey to see vvhither my friend vveare liuing or no, and to bring me certeine nevves thereof. He seeeng theis bookes vpon his table and telling him that they vvere nouelties in these contreys, he sent them to me by him: and so receuing them in Septembre last, vvhen I had read them cursorely ouer, I threvv then in a corner neuer thinking to look on them againe (so vnpleasant are contentious bookes vnto me) but hauing receaued this Apologie and conferred them together, I began to perceiue vvhat the grovvnde and substance vvas of this scandalous controuersie, the vvhich before I neglected and cared not for. And findinge this Apologie to be vvritten rather to augment then to extinguish the contentions, and perceuinge that the others vvent simply to vvorke, in setting dovvne truly & simply the causes of theese controuersies, but the Apologye to flye as from a serpent the true causes thereof. And beside seeing the chief hedd of this controuersie, to depende vpon a pointe of lavve, I could not hold my hand, but vvas driuen in recompence of the booke you sent me, to send you these pointes vvherin I mislike the Apologie, and vvherin they

ought to haue ſatisfied (as they do not) their frendes and readers. I hope in reading it vvithout affection you shall perceaue vvho thoſe be that Sibi imputare debent, qui cauſam dederunt, quique illi ſunt, as you note of our holy Martyr S. Thomas, & vpon them the væ illis &c. is like in thend to fall. For my part I miſlike vvith the diſcontẽted brethern for one thing, vvith the Ieſuites for 2. thinges: vvith the Archprieſt for as many: and vvith the Apologie for a great nomber of faults it hath committed, as by this diſcourſe is made euident. VVith the diſcontented priſtes, not for vvriting, for it vvas neceſſarie for them ſo toe doe, bicauſe it ſtood vpõ their honor, honeſtie and credite: but for vvritting as they did hardly both of the vvhole ſocietie, and of diuers particular Fathers and prieſts. If they had kept thẽ ſelues vvith in the compas of their matter in the latin booke to his Hol: as they did in the latin booke to the Inquiſitors: the Apologie maker muſt haue held his peace for any aduantage he could haue had againſt them. The firſt fault of the Fathers vvas, for that they meadled in a matter nothing at all apparteinning to them. For vvhat haue religious men (that haue a diſtincte bodie, and a diſtinct common vveale, and haue diſtinct Superiors,) to doe vvith an other bodie, and common vveale diſtinct and ſepart from them? VVhat had they to doe vvith the affaires, aſſociations and contentions of ſecular prieſtes? yea

vvhat had the Ieſuites more to doe to meadle in it, then the Benedictines, Charterhovvſe Moncks, & Capuchines? of vvhich orders vve haue diuers of our natiõ as deſirous of, and as zealous for the good of our contrey as the English Fa. can be? Their ſecond fault vvas, in vvritting of that vnlearned and ſcandalous booke of ſchiſme againſt the Prieſtes that vvere innocent thereof and farr from the note of ſedition and rebellion, for that vvithſtanding the Archprieſtes inſtitution vpon a Cardinalls letters, vvithout his Hol. Bull: as in this diſcourſe is ſufficiently proued. I find not ſo great fault vvith the vvritter (for he might be commanded to doe it) as vvith the Superior for commanding it to be done. and vvhen it vvas done ſo vnadviſedly by his ſubſcription to approue it. for our rule in lavve ſaith: ea noſtra facimus quibus noſtra impartimur authoritatem. VVe make thoſe things our ovvne, to the vvhich vve doe impart our auctthoritie.

One of the Archprieſtes faultes vvas, for that vvithout iudgement and prudence he ſubſcribed alſo to that booke and by his approbatiõ made it as currant as he could. His other faulte vvas, his ouer much ſeueritie tovvardes his bretherne: as vvell appeareth by his anſvveres to them laid dovvne in their appeale, and neither checked nor controuled by this Apologie. I might ioyne to this his toſſing of the cenſures vvithout any regard or reuerence.

Nouv for the faultes of this Apologie, I referre you to that vvhich followveth. If I haue vvrõged the Authors thereof either in my vvords, or by mistaking the sence of theirs, I submitt me self to the iust reprehension of any learned and vnpassionat man vvhosoeuer, and promisse all due and charitable satisfaction. And that I my self vvas free from all affection or passion vvhen I vvrote it, (except that some times I may vtter some sharpe vvorde, their fault being so euident and exorbitant, that an Angell vvould haue dipped his pene in gaule) may be easily cõiectured, by that I vvas neuer, (as I haue said) of the one faction or th'other: but allvvaie kept me self free and cleare from all passion, loving and honoring both sides and parties as my deare contreymẽ, hauing vvished and desired that some good peace and appointment might be made amongst them. Nouv for more proof of my neutralitie first, I neuer vvrote or subscribed any letter in my life either against the Fathers for the' others, nor for the Fa. against them, nor euer vvas dealer in any actiõ Pro or con, for either partie. Secondly, there haue passed throughe this touvne men of both sides, and also haue lodged vvith me somtimes men of either faction, at one and the self same time: The vvhich vvere equally vvellcome vnto me, I gaue them allvvaies the like and equall countenãce, bicause I loved them egally, for that they vvere English Priests or

Catholikes. And for this I referre me to the report of such of either side, that haue done me that honor and pleasure as to visite me. Lastly if I could be parciall or affected more to one side then an other (as in truth I cannot be) there are many reasons and causes, vvhy I should leane rather to the Archpriest & his side, them to th'other. for that I haue many old and deare frēds of that side, both at home and abrode: to omitt the Archpriest him self vvith vvhom I haue bene acquainted aboue theese 35. yeares, as vvell in Oxford, as in Douvay, and since that in Ingland. My brother vvho should be the dearest to me in this vvorld (as I vvdrestand) is of that side: So is M. Henry Shavve my oldest frend, one of the 6. assistāts named by the Card. M. Brāston, ād M. VViggs, vve hauing beene brought vp together & fellovves of one and the same colleage. and to the last very particulary bound for a singuler frendshipp he once in Douvay shevved me. Besids M. Archer (vvhom these nicnamed the discontented bretherne seame egerly to pursue) is my deare frend and godsoon. To omitt a great nombre of my acquaintance that are amongest the vnited Priest (as they are named) the supposed Authors of this Apologie. On th'other side I knovv no man vvith vvhom I am familiarly acquainted but M. Edvvard Bennett, nor to vvhom I am bound for any benefitt or extraordinarie frendshipp receaved, but to M. Bluett, vvho

ſome 25. yeares ſince, did me a good turne, the vvhich if euer occaſion shalbe offered, I meane to requite in eodem genere amicitiæ. By theſe fevve you may perceive hovv free I am from faction and cleare frō all paſsion to either partie. You may ask me then, hovv chauuce you begine novv to entremeadle, the ſtrife and ſturre being at the vvhotteſt? I anſvvere. If I had neuer ſeene the Apologie, I should neuer haue thought vpon the matter: but ſeeing ſuch fond and foolish matter therin, and by that booke perceiuing the iuſtice of the cauſe of thoſe called diſcontented Prieſts, I could not hold my hand I confeſſe, but for your ſake and in recompence of the booke, to ſend you my aduice there vpon, hoping you vvill looke more deeper into the cauſe and cōſider of it beter and not geve ſuch credit to the Apologie as you ſeeme by your letters to doe, and vvith all to ſee more clealy vvhere the faultes of all theſe ſcandalous and vncharitable troubles are to be laid, and vvho vvere the firſt occaſioners of it, and after that, the renevvers therof. This is the end and ſcope of my vvritting. I haue not reſpected my fore ſaid frends, nor the Fathers amongſt vvhō I haue many a good frend quia magis mihi amica eſt veritas. truth and true dealing betvvene Prieſts and Religious, ought to be preferred before all vvorldly reſpects and carnall frēds: as I haue endevored to doe in theſe notes of myne. And ſo after my humbleſt and hartieſt commenda-

tions to you and by you to all the Seniors of my acquaintance with you. I committ you to god and my self to your deuout Memento *from Pont. a Mussion.*

Your Wour. to serue and honor.
H. E.

TO THE VNITED PRIESTS.

MY Reuerend and deerely beloued in our ſauiour the vnited Prieſts, the ſuppoſed Authors of a brief Apolog. vvhich is ſett out vnder your names, againſt certaine venerable Prieſts, ancient and conſtant Confeſſors your brethren & companions in this fight againſt heretikes, and defence of the Catholike cauſe, by you yet termed & called Diſcontented Brethren, I haue ſeene and read that Apologie not vvithout great greife and ſorrovve of mynd, to ſee the, children of one happy and vertuous father (I meane that learned pious man of vvorthy and famous memorie Card. Allé) to be ſo amongſt themſelues deuided, to be ſo in hart and mynde ſeperated, to be ſo in loue and affection diſvnited, that

the one parte vvriteth againſt the other vvhat doe I ſay, vvrite? nay doe ſo calumniat one an other, and as it vvere teare in peeces the fame, name, and good renovvne, one of the other. A lamẽtable caſe no doubt to ſee ſuch as are in durance and fetters for the faith, ſo farre from Charitie; to ſee holie Confeſſors and deſigned martyrs ſo farre from brotherly loue and affection: to ſee ſuch good Prieſts quite forgett the ſecond cheifeſt precept of Chriſtian Religiõ vvhich is *Diliges proximum tuum ſicut teipſum.* hovve can any man be perſvvaded that you loue your ſelues or your ovvne ſoules helths, that doo not loue your egall Chriſtian, men of your ovvne coate and qualitie? men of your ovvne educatiõ, vvith vvhome you haue been brought vp in the hame houſe, in the ſame ſtudie, and at the ſame table. I doubt not but that bleſſed prelate doth ſee it *VVith greate cõpaßion*; as I my ſelf one of his eldeſt children, and one of your auncienteſt brethren doo moſt hartely. Seeing therefore this diſſention among you, and my fathers houſe as it vvere ou fyre, imitating that holie man *Aphraates* of vvhom *Nicephorus* maketh mention, I haue gotten out of myne hermitage, that is, I haue left for a time my lavve bookes, and am come to aduertiſe you my vnited brethren frendly and brotherly of 2. things eſpecially. The firſt is, that if you be the Authors of this Apologie, that

Lib. 11. *c.* 25.

then you leave and deſiſt to purſue this contention and controuerſie, becauſe you hane the vvorſer end of the ſtaffe; and defend againſt your conſcience and knovvledge (as in theſe notes is manifeſtly proued) an vniuſt and ruinous cauſe. The other, yf you be not the Authours (as I ſuppoſe you are not) that then you doe not ſuffer your ſelues to be any longer abuſed, and your names to be borrovved, to th'end to continue cõtention and diſſention betvveene you and your brethren, to one of theſe, to conſent or ſatisfie you are bound in conſcience. for hovve can you or dare you being in perſecution and as it vvere at the perſecutors diſpoſition, being once aduertiſed of your faulte and errors, continue ſtill in the ſame, vvithout a notorious marke of obſtination, vvch is the mother of hereſie? And vvith vv hat conſcience can you lend your names not onely to the continuing and furthering of contẽtion: but alſo to the debaſing, diſgracing and defamation of your ovvne coate & vocatiõ, yea and to the defacing of your ovvne ſelues as is oftẽ noted ãd tolde you in theſe notes. I haue doõ myne endenour to vvarne and aduertiſe you, it is your part to follvve the good counſell of a frend, and eſpecially of a common frend, as you all doo knovve, I am vnto you all, both vnited & diſcontented. For myne ovvne part, (as I hane often proteſted & ſtil doe)

I am not paſſioned, nor leaning more to one ſide then thother, nor affectioned more to thone, then to thother: but have many moe deere frends amongſt thvnited then amongſt thother. Yet the truth vvhich is to be preferred before all vvorldly frendship, and the infinite faultes of this Apologie, haue driuen me to runne amongſt you vvith *Aphraates*, to ſee if I can quench the fire, that begynneth to ruynate and deſtroy our Saluiours church at home in our contrey: by shevving you hovve vniuſtly you receued the Archp. vpō a Cardinals letters, hovv ſcandalouſlie and falſely your brethren for their iuſt reſiſtance vvere ſclandered to be ſchiſmaticks: and hovve vniuſtly and vncharitablie the Archp. and Ieſuites after the Popes bull vvas cōmē, ād their ſubmiſſiō made thereto, theſe vvere nevvlie & freshlie ſlandered to be ſchiſmaticks for the former occation. I doe heere shovve you that theſe are the cheifeſt points novve in controuerſie, that your brethren had both lavve and reaſon for them, that this your Apologie is ſo farre from cōming neere to theſe queſtions, and the handlinge there of, thath it hath not anſvveared any one of abdoue 30. Reaſons, vvhich your brethrē bring for their defence. Hovve can you by this kinde of vvriting, I vvill not ſaie ſatisfie your reader, but your ovvne conſcience and knovvledge? This paine I haue taken

both for your ſakes, and your readers alſo, to thend they be not deceiued by this Author vvhoſoeuer he be. yf you take it in good part, and vvith that affection that I vvrott it, I ſhall haue thought my paines vvell employed: but if you take it in euill part I cannot doo vvith all, myne intention being to doe good. Yf you replie, I vvil triplicat as vvell as I can. Yf you ſhall iudg me partiall, in tyme and place I vvill prooue the contrarie, ſoe that you ſhall beconſtrained to confeſſe as much. yf by this meanes I ſhall open but ſomme of your eyes and make you to conceiue the indignitie of the thinge I haue my deſire. I beſeech God ſo open your harts and eyes, that you ſuffer not your ſelues to be carried avvaie hereafter vvith toyes and trifles, as it ſeemeth hitherto you haue beene, and to give you the grace to looke more deepely in to the matter, and not permitt your ſelues and your names to be borrovved & abuſed for the extolling of ſomme and the depreſſion of your ſelues and of your qualitie, and vocation, as you haue ſuffered hitherto, to your ovvne diſcredit, the contynuance of ſtrife, hindrance of the cath: faith, Gods diſhonour, and our contreyes great hurt, and ſo I committ me ſelf to your deuout *Memento*, and to your chaynes.

THE PREFACE.

TO omit the 2. places of ſcripture, put in the begynning of your Apologie, bicauſe the firſt is impertinēt, for neither the Protector nor the Archp. vvas their ſuperior before his. Hol. Bull. came, as is often proued in theſe notes. the other may be very aptly applyed to the Archp. and our english Ieſuites in Inglād, vvho vvere the firſt Authors and cauſers of all theſe contentiōs abroade and at home, by vvriting and teaching that the Prieſts vvhich refuſed to receiue the Archp. vpon a Card. lettres vvithout ſcripp or ſcroule frō his Hol. vvere Schiſmatikes, ſeditious, rebellious, and I knovv not vvhat: as alſo is proued in theſe notes. Beſide, the Archp. after the Bull vvas come and the prieſts had ſubmitted themſelues thereto, began the broyle againe by pronouncing and proclayming them Schiſmaticks as before, vvhich alſo is ſett dovvne in theſe notes. S. Paul vvilleth vnquiete people but eſpecialy the Authors of vnquietnes tō

be repreſſed (as you ſay) or to be rebuked (as I ſay): but the Arch. and Ieſuites vvere the Authors of this vnquietnes, as is shevved at large in theſe notes, ergo you haue brought S. Paul againſt theſe, vvhome you pretend to defend and cleere from vnquietnes. I beſeech you then (my vnited brethrē) to looke better to the matter, and to pluck of the maske of affectiō that novve blindeth you, and to cōſider vvell that the renevving of the crime of ſchiſme by the Archp. vvas the onely cauſe vvhy they vvr ote in defence of their good name honor and fame, as is proued hereafter.

But theſe ſcriptures are not ſo impertinētly brought, as the place vvhich you alledge out of S. Auguſtin, vvhich is flatt againſt you for in this Apo. (as he ſaith) *you knovv not to diſtinguish betvveene true ād falſe* yea you dare not once approche and come neere the truth. *nor betvveene probations & criminations*: many criminations indeede you put dovvne, but you bring noe probation at all. *betvvene inſtructions and fictions*: your Apol. being vvholly compiled of *fictions* and fittons, of toyes and trifles, ſo farre is it from geuing any inſtructions, pertayning to the matter in queſtion & controuerſie. *betvveene handling the cauſe, and runing from the cauſe*. neuer vvere men ſo liuely deſcribed by theſe vvords as you are for you are ſo farre from handling the cauſe

that all your drifte is to runne from the cauſe as is manifeſtly shevved in theſe notes: and I doubt not but that your readers hauing once read theſe notes vvill much vvonder at your audacitie for alleaging a place in the very front of your booke that maketh ſo euidently againſt you: and that doth ſo palpably controule and deſcrie your Iuggling, fraude, and guile. *yf you knovve it not?* viz. that this your Apol. dooth not diſtinguish betvveene true and falſe, that it hath many Criminations and noe probatiõs at all of the matter in que tion that it is full of fictions, and voyde of all inſtructions: that it handleth not the cauſe, but rũneth and roveth quite from the cauſe, *yf* (I ſay) *you knovv it not?* then *I am not ſorie that I haue had this care to inſtruct you.* and if thereby. *your harts vvill not be turned to peace, yet our peace returneth to vs* as it did to S. Auguſtine.

In the epiſtle to his Hol.

In the verie begynning of your epiſtle to the Pope, you tell his Hol. vvith *vvhat greiſe of mynd and confuſion of countenãce you are conſtrained to defend the eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie vvhich God inſpired* him *to inſtitute amongſt vs.* you may vvell ſay: vvith *Confuſion of countenance* for to make ſo falſe a report to his Hol: in the verie entrie of your booke: vvhich Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie I pray you doe you defend in this your Apol? you ſhould here hane diſtinguiſhed vvith, S. Auguſtine, *betvveene true and*

falſe for there vvere (you knovve) tvvo inſtitutions of this Hierarchie, one by the Card. letters, as you confeſſe in the 8. pag. of your epiſtle and in the 10. you talke of an other inſtitution made by his Hol: breue 1599. In defence of vvhich of theſe 2. Inſtitutions, I praie doo you vvrite? yf of the firſt, thé may you vvell in deede, haue *greiſe of mynde and be confuſed in countenance*, yea and cautherized in conſcience for abuſing his Hol: vvith ſo notorious a falshood. But teil me in good earneſt is, *This Apol. vvritten to the Catholicks of Ingland in defence of the eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie*, inſtituted by the Cardinals letters? yf you ſay yea: theſe notes doo vtter your impudencie, and doe shevve to all Catholicks in Ingland and out of Inglād, that you neuer dare come neere the queſtion, but that you flie from it as from a Toade: and thar you haue not as yet anſvvered one onely reaſon of moe then 30. that your brethren bring againſt it, albeit your account thē but fonde and of no force at all. Let all Catolickes novve Iudgee if you ought not vvorthely to be *cōfuſed in countenance* to make ſo flatt a fitton to his Hol: and that in print, in making him and all men to beleeue that you vvrite this your Apol. in defence (forſooth of the Eccleſiaſtical *Hierarchie, by him ſo fatherly and prudently inſtituted amongſt vs*: vvhen as (I ſay) I shovve to all ſuch as are not ſtarke blinde, in theſe my notes:

that you flie from and shoone that matter, as from a venemous Serpent: yf then you haue abuſed his Hol: touching the firſt inſtitution hovve can you excuſe your ſelues and ſay: that this your Apol. is vvritten in defence of the ſecond inſtitution, made and confirmed by his Hol: buls? A faire peece of vvorke vvho I praie you dooth or hath impugned it? you fight vvith your ovvne shadovve in making his Hol. belecue, your vvriting is in defence of his inſtitution of the Archpr. you should firſt haue prooued it to be impugned, and then to haue defended it. Nay, it is ſo farre from being impugned by your brethren, that you confeſſe frankly in this and many other places of your Apol. that ſo ſoone as they ſavve his *Hol*: *Breue* they by and by yeelded and vvere recõciled to the Archp. novve the cauſe bothe of this firſt and latter breache alſo, vvhich vvas, for that they vvere holden and proclaimed by bookes and lettres, and confirmed by the Archp. ſentence, for ſchiſmaticks, rebellious, and factious (vvhich is the head and ground of all this controuerſie) you mention not at all. and yet you are ſo shameles, as to tell Chriſtes vicar, that you vvrite in defence of the Archp. for the reſiſting of vvhoſe inſtitution vpon a Card. letters your brethren vvere defamed vvith the horrible cryme of ſchiſme. Vvell, if you haue in this your Apol. defended neither the

firſt nor laſt inſtitution hovve are you able to defend your ſelues from a moſt haynõs falshood? I charge you vvith it and that in good earneſt, and in your next either diſcharge your ſelues in shevving, that you haue defended the one or the other inſtitution, and that by ſolid and ſubſtantiall prooffes, orels I vvill leaue you the vvhetſtone, as vvorthily gayned by you, and that in fittoning to the higheſt povver and Potentat vpon earth.

The reader may gather by this epiſtle, hovve ſubſtantially you hãdle the matter through out your Apolog. for the ſame order you keepe heere, the ſame kinde of prooffes you obſerue aud bringtherein. you haue taken vpon you to defend the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie inſtitured by his Hol. lett vs ſee hovv coningly and learnedly you doo it. Firſt, in the yeare 1558 her Maieſtie began to raigne, and the Proteſtants gayned more in the firſt 10. yeares of her raigne, then in the 34. that haue euſued, ergo, the inſtitutiõ of the Arch. made, by a Card. lettres, vvas lavve full and to be obayed. In the yeare 1568. the colledge at Douay vvas erected by D. Allen. ergo, the inſtitution of the Archp. vvas lavvfull. And heere is to be noted, you haue ſett the Cart before the horſe. for firſt you mẽtiõ the ſeminary of Douay, ãd fondatiõ thereof, ãd then after, hovv learned men placed them ſelues in diuers vniuerſities, and vvrote bookes in

confutation of hereſie. vvhereas, theſe men you meane, hadde vvritten their bookes many a faire yeare before there vvas any Seminarie thoght or dreamed of. I vvould pray the Reader heere to marke vvell the order of this tale laid dovvne in their ſecond note, and I vvil maruell if thou maruell not much at it.

3. The Councell, bent themſelues vvhollie to perſecute the Seminarie ergo the Archp. &c.

4. The counſell labored to dryue the Seminarie out of *Rhemes* ergo the Archp. &c.

5. The counſell raiſed ſedition amongſt our ſelues go. &c. But by your leaue, this is another fitton. for there vvas neuer any diſſention much leſſe ſedition in the Seminarie of *Rhemes* ſo long as *D. Allen* gouernd it. vvith this therefore, as vvith a manifeſt fittō I charge you, diſcharge your ſelues for your ovvne honor in your next: and in that you name *Banes*, I vvould you ſhould knovve, he vvas not ſent thither as a ſpie, but there in the Seminarie he became a naughtie ſpie, and vvas taken and punished there as a ſpie, by the vniforme conſent of all from the higheſt to the lovveſt: ſo farre vvas he from making any ſedition there, as vndecently you informe his Hol. in this place. But I praie you, vvhat ſeede of ſeditiou ſovved *John Nicols*, or *Salomon Alread*, or *Monday*, or *Sledd*, in Rome? I doo oppoſe you novve. I beleeue as vvell as you

that they vvere ſpies, and I knovve that they vvere aftervvards in Ingland very naughtie fellovves, and did much hurt there: but I am ashamed that you shold either ſay or thinke that ſuch baſe varlets coulde ſovve any ſeede of ſedition in Rome: all thoſe that knevve thoſe companions vvill controule you of ouerſight in this point, aſvvell as I doo. But be it they ſovved ſeditiō in Rome in the yeare 1578. gº. the inſtitution of the Archp. made by a Card. letters in the yeare 1598. (iuſt 20. yeares after) vvas good and lavvfull, for this muſt be your conclution, othervviſe all that you haue there ſet dovvne is to no end or purpoſe, neither doe you shovve thereby to vvrite *in defence of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie inſtituted by his Hol. amongſt vs*, but rather of other gugavves and by matters.

In the yeare 1580. fa: *Parſons*, and fa: *Campio* vvere ſent into Ingland. gº. if the skie fall, vvee shall haue larkes, beit that by their cominge, religion begāne to go vvith more feruor yet is not that true *that diuers ancient and graue prieſts vvent in vvith them by their example and perſvvaſion.* not by their example (I ſay) for many a prieſt vvas gone in many yeares before the Ieſuits vvent in . and thoſe that vvent in eithervvith thē or after them, vvere prieſts ſent in by the ordinary miſſion, and not by their example: onely 3. or 4. that had beene Chaplyns in the Rom. College vver 6.

perſvvaded by D. Allen (from vvhome you vvould take this praiſe) and not by the fathers, to go into Ingland: and this I referre to the conſcieuce and report of *M. D. Bauande*, vvho onely is yet living (as I vnderſtand) of all thoſe ancient and graue Prieſts. novve as I vvould not take any right full praiſe frō the fathers: ſo can I not endure other mens praiſes to be vniuſtly attributed to them.

7. In the yeares 1582. and 1584. there begann an emulation in Paris of ſomme Gentlemen againſt D. Allen and fa. pa. g°. the Archp. vvas rightly inſtituted. I beleeue you doo iniurie toe thoſe gentlemen in ſaynig they induced *Tyrell*, *Gifford*, and *Gratley* to ioyne and treate vvith thē. for in your booke you lay it dovvne thus: *fol. 26.* *A combination vvas made by ſomme of our order vvith vvalſingham to the preiudice of D. Allen and fa. pa.* and in your mergent you put dovvne the confeſſiō of G. G. ſuppoſe that he vvere VValzinghams ſpie, yet I doo not beleeue that the Gentlemē knevve ſomuch, and you are not of ſuch credit vvith me, that I ſhould take all that you ſpeake for goſpell. They haue both vvit and meanes to defend their honor, ſeing you haue geuen them the occaſion, and ſo often blotted your Apolog. vvith their names.

8. Tvvo prieſts vvrote ſeuerall booke in fauor of the hereticks in the yeares 87. and 88. and and one vvas a ſpie for the Counſell of Inglād

&c. g°. Powles ſteeple and charing Croſſ. may meete.

The counſell of Ingland omitted not to maintenie the faction and emulatiõ all Card. Allens life. g°. &c. and the Card. a little before his death perceaving a factiõ to growe in Ingland againſt the fathers, wrote moſt earneſtly againſt it g°. the Archp. was wel inſtituted. 9.

Cardinall Sega dedicated the viſitation of the Rom. College to his Hol. g° iumppe as before. 10.

His Hol. by word of mouth comaunded the prieſts that went into Ingland from Rome in the yeare 1597. to be qniet for the tyme to come. g°. the diſcontented brethrene are ſeditious. And heere are we come to the ſubordinarion that was ordeyned by the Card. Protectors letters, which is the point in cõtrouerſie *Wither any laufull ſubordination, or any dignitie may be giuen or inſtituted by the bare letters of a Cardinall ſaing he did it. Ex expreſſo mandato Sanctiſſimi.* without the Popes bul or breue? your brethren and I with them ſay no. and both they and I, haue proued our aſſertion. you ſay yea; but doo proue nothing in all this your Apol. albeit (as you doe falſely flapp is Hol. in the teeth) you haue written it in defence of his Inſtitution. but I hope at length after your long vagaries and runing at Rouers, you will be ſo good as your word 11.

and proue that the *Ecclesiastical Hierarhie* vvas lavvfully and duly instituted by the Card. Protectors letters vvithout the Popes Bull. for this you must proue, or els you may looke vvith *a confused countenance* and be much greeued in mynd, to haue promised more to his Hol. then you haue hitherto, or euer shalbe able to performe. I pitie your case, and am in deede full sorie, to see hovve you haue plucked an old hovvse vpon your hed. *VVith this Subordination all good and obedient Catholickes vvere contented and cõforted* (you saie) gº it vvas lavvfully instituted. but vvheare you saie, *it came from the see Apostolicke*; by your leave you fitten. for nothing is said to comme *from the see Apostolick*, except it come vnder the *Breues* or Buls of that see. as in these notes shalbe prooued. but heere vvas no Bull from that See, gº you say not vvell, that it came from the See Apostolike, seing it came but from a Card. Protector vvho had no authoritie to doe it, nor any iurisdiction or povver at all in Ingland. you add: *that they called in question the Card. letters*, and that vvhich followveth, so they did in deede and that instly, and still doe, for any thing you haue, or can say to the contrarie, or in defence of the Card. or his letters.

In all this your Apol. (vvhich you make his Hol. beleeue is vvritten in defence of the Card. institutiõ of the Archp.) you haue not one

one vvord or reaſon. I ſay, not one, for the defence of the Card. and his dooings: you ſay: *they impugned his Hol. meaning*. hovv I praie you could they doe that, hauing nether that breue, bul, nor letter frō his Hol. explicating or declaring to them his meaning? it is but your imagination. hovve (I praie you) can I tell vvhat your meaning is, except you explicat the ſame to me, ether by vvord of mouth letter, or expreſſe meſſēger. But his Hol. by none of theſe meanes shevved or declared his meaning vnto them. g°. they could not impugne it.

But that vvhich follovveth is a meere calumnie: *yea they called into qnoſtion your authoritie it ſelfe, vvhither you could doo it vvithout them or no.* this to be a nanghtie slander and a fovvle calumnie is often proued in theſe notes, to the places I referre you.

At laſt vvee are come to the Popes breue in cōfirmatiō of the ſaid *Hierarchie*, to the vvhich you confeſſe your brethren did obey, but after ſought *occaſions to breake againe*. vvhat vvere theſe occaſiōs? forshooth, as you calumniat: thē *they vvere ſo engaged to the councell that they could not hold long*. The counſell ſerueth you vvell for a maske, to couer the cauſe of this laſt breach: vvhich yet they lay dovvne othervviſe both ſimplie and plainly, and lay it vpon the Archp. and Ieſuits backe, and that ſo firmely, that in all your Apol. you cannot

as yet clavve it of, neither in deede doe you goe abont it, the matter is ſo plaine and euident. Hovve iuſtlie they appealed, is shevved hereafter. I knovve not vvhat you meane in this your epiſtle by *Scandalous and temerarious propoſitions*: But ſure I am, that you your ſelues haue accuſed and accompted the cheifeſt points of our Cath. religion, for *ſcandalous, dangerous, and offenſiue doctrine*, to your eternall shame, as in theſe notes vvill appeere.

I vvould to God they or any other could get libertie of conſcience in Ingland, vnder conditiõ that all the fathers vvere out, and I my ſelf banished vvith them neuer to comme in ſo longe as I liue. yf you or the fathers had that zeale and charitie to your contrey, you should not miſlike of this condition, if libertie could be gotten by it. But I ſee vvel, you are farre frõ the zeale of S. Paul. vvhy (my Maiſters) cannot Cath. religion be taught and planted in Ingland vvithout the fathers? it should ſeeme you are of that opinion, bicauſe you like not of that condition, vvhich all good men ought to like of: if vvee could haue the libertie of our conſcience reſtored vnto vs ſo good cheape.

VVell, as you began vvith a fitton, ſo I perceiue you vvill end vvith a flatt lye: for (ſay you) *in this Apol. vvee doo laie dovvne by cleere hiſtoricall narration and authenticall teſtimonies the groundes of all*. Of vvhat all? of the controuer-

ſie betvveene the Archp. and your diſcontẽted brethren? nothing leſſe, as hath beene often ſaid. your hiſtorical narratiõ is nothing but a recapitulation of the ſeditions of the Rom. college, of the factiõs in Paris, againſt D. Allen and fa. pa. of the factions in Flanders againſt fa. Holt and M. ovvcn, of G. G. ſpierie and books againſt D. Allen, and fa. par. of R. Fishers examination, of the praiſe of the fathers, of M VVatſons common vvelth and of the ſturres in vviſbich. No narration at all, either hiſtoriall or legal, of the controuerſie novve in queſtion. your authentical teſtimonies are a great nomber of tedious letters vvritten by priuat men, either the fathers creatures, or vvhollie addicted to their faction: vvhich yet for the more part prooue not that for the vvhich they are brought and alledged. *Authenticall* (qnoth you) euen as *authenticall*, as an obligation ſealed vvith butter, and all one. vvho euer heard priuat mens letters miſſiues to be called and termed *authentical teſtimonies*? in deede ſuch are the authentical prooffes you bring and none els. hovve durſt you ſo abuſe his Hol. vvithout blushing, as to tell him, that euery priuat mans letter is an *authentical teſtimonie*? God of his mercie open your eyes, that you may ſee your ovvne error and follie, that thereby yeelding to the truth and leauing all contention, you may goe on forvvards as you haue

begunne, to vvynn Soules, to aduance Gods glorie, and relieue and comfort his afflicted English church, vvhich groneth more bitterly vnder the vvaight of this diſſention, then it euer did, or dooth vnder the greauous burthen of perſecution.

There you abuſe your Reader againe making him beleeue that your *Booke vvas vvritten to laie forth the progreſſe and ſucceſſe of the vvhol Controuerſie, by a ſerious and orderly narration of the Cheife matters*: a ſtrange thing to ſee your vanitie, you lay foorth in deede a ſerions narration of all the factions that haue beene ſince the Seminaries begunne, but vvhat is that to the Queſtion novve in controuerſie? haue you laide dovvne by a ſerious and orderly narration the cauſe of thoſe 2. breaches the occaſion of this diſſention? Mumme. haue you laid dovvne their Reaſons that mooued them, not to receiue the Archp. vpon the Card. letters? No. haue you laid dovvne hovv fa. Lieſter by vvriting vvould prooue them ſchiſmaticks for the ſame? Neque: haue you laid dovvne hovve after their vnion vvith the Archp. the ſame Archp. pronounced them Schiſmaticks for nor admitting him vpon the Card. letters, and forbade all Prieſts to abſolue them? no forſooth. And vvhy ſo? bicauſe *vvee vvill not talke of it, and are ſorie that euer it vvas mentioned*. theſe are the controuerſies in queſtion, theſe are the

cheife matters, and hereof you should haue ſett dovvne *a ſerious and orderly narration*. but you dare as vvell eate your fingers as to come neere to theſe queſtions and cheif matters: you ly a loofe, for feare of knocks. I cannot blame you, *Leo eſt in uia.* the Truth is ſo dredfull, that you dare not approche it. you ſtand a farre of, and caſt your shuttcock of Rom. ſeditions, factions of Paris, and flā-ders: examinations, common vvealthes, and bundels of letters, as it vvere at their heads. but therevvith you cannot hurt them. and to approche and cloſe vvith them in the cheif matters novve in controuerſie, you dare not. Fie vpon impudencie, you ate not content vvith your *ſerious and orderlie narrations* of your flym flābs: but you vvill alſo *ſett dovvne their vntruthes &c. as they lye, that thereby the reader may iudge of their ſpirit and manner of proceeding.* In Gods name goe on then.

Friſt, you finde no leſſe then 5. or 6. *deceipts ſhifts, and falshoods in th' inſcription of the latin booke.* to vſe your ovvne vvords, Reader heerby thou mayſt geſſe vvhat truth thou maiſt expect at theſe mans hands in the reſt of their booke, vvhem they begin vvith ſo deceiptfull a calumnie. For, in the place by me heere noted is shevved, that they haue not committed any one deceipt, shift, or falshood in the inſcription of that booke: but that you (vnited brethren) haue committed ſo noto- *fol.* 111. *& ſeq.*

rious and groſſe a falshood, that it paſſeth all their 6. vveare they ſuch as you terme them,

The ſecond, is out of the 3. pag. and not out of the 2. as you qnote it. theſe are their vvords: *hinc enim &c. on one ſide vvee are greuouſly vvounded and murthered by the common enemy, on th'other ſide vvee are grevvouſly oppreſſed vvith mutuál contentiõs and ſtrifes.* vvhat deceipt, ſhift, or falshood, is theare in theſe vvords? are you not vvonderfully blinded vvith mallice to ſet them dovvne for ſuch? no (ſay you) bicauſe fevve of theſe men haue beene vvounded or putt to death by the common enemy. For putting to death I beleeue you, for they are all yet liuing: but if you dare ſay, that none of thoſe that haue beene of their opinion haue ſuffred death: then dare I ſaie, you dare ſaie an vntruth. VVounded (qnoth you) vvhy? haue not many of theſe endured impriſonement, banishmẽt, loſſe of their goods and libertie for the cath. cauſe ſoe vvel as you my vnited brethren?) and doe they not by Gods grace, ſtãd as firme and ſtable, againſt the common ennemy in defence of the cath. cauſe, as you doe? Impudencie it ſelf cannot gainſay it.

To omit the ſlander of their ſecret nouriſhing by the counſell: you anſvvere fondly that their oppreſſiõ is none, but ſuch as they liſt to imagin, vvhen all men haue ſeene thẽ vvithout imaginatiõ in fact ãd deede to haue

beene oppreſſed theſe many yeares. let your Reader conſider heere, vvith vvhat goodly toies you fill your booke: and vvith all, your infidelitie in nipping of your latter vvord of the ſentence, vvhich shevved vvherein they vvedre greuouſely oppreſſed *vvith mutual contentions*, the reader may vvell coniecture vvith *vvhat ſpirit you vvrite*, and in vvhat manner yov intend to proceede.

The 3. *Cogimur, &c. vvee are forced te flie to the feete of your Hol.* &c. vvhat vntruth is heere? did they not flie to his feete by printing their booke? knovving that ſomme copie thereof vvould come to his Hol. hands or knovvledge, *vel per notum aliquem* (as they ſaie elſvvhere) *vel ignotum amicum vel inimicum, caſu vel dedita opera*. but hovve proue you this to be a falshood? bicauſe they neuer ſent yet any of their appellations to his Hol, nor any man to proſecute them, I giue you a ſufficient reaſon therefore in theſe notes. But hovve dooth this followve they neuer ſent any of theire appellations as yet to his Hol. ergo, it is falſe and fayned, in that they ſaye, they are compelled to flie by this their printed booke to his Hol. feete. this argument is tied together vvith points. *fol. 54. cum ſeq. & fol. 110.* *pagin. 5.*

The 4. *Hæc autem &c. vvee are forced* (ſai you) *to diuulgate thes things in print &c.* but they ſaie thus: *vvee are forced full ſore aginſt our vvills* (in-

uitißime ſane) you haue herein deſcouered your ovvne falshood in nipping of theſe vvords in the Parentheſis, vvhen you goe about to shevve a falshood, vvhere there is none at all. And of this compulſion againſt their vvils, they add immediatly 3. reaſons, vvhich you deceipt fully omit. vvhat deceit, shift, or falshood are in theſe vvords my blinded brethren? or in the 3. Reaſons they yeeld for this their dooing? O hovve mallice dooth blinde, if not a religious man, yet deſigned martyrs? this force (ſay you) came frō the councell. hovve ſoeuer it came, they cōmitted neither deceipt nor falshood, for ſaying they vvere forced to doe it. Nay, this force proceeded of fa. liſters ſcandalous booke, and of the indiſcrete ſubſcription and approbation thereof, by the ſuperiour and the Archp. they vvere forced (I ſay) to defend their honour, good name and fame, ſo ſtayned and blotted vvith the haynons crime of ſchiſme by the aforenamed, as in their. 3. reaſons heere they tell you plainly. but you are blind and deaf: your (*for informing his Hol alone*,) printing vvas not needefull, is refuted in theſe notes followving.

Your 5. Is in the 6. and not in the 5. pag. as you vvote. *Igitur dum, &c. Vvherefore vvhile Card. Allē our cōmō father vvas liuing*, &c. cough out? vvhy, haue you the chyncough? thus

they ſay: *vvherefore vvhile the Comon father of vs all* (Prieſts and Ieſuits) *and the health and ſauegard of ovvr Contrey vvas living, that honorable man of bleſſed memorie Card. Allen a moſt vviſe and holie man, all our affaires aſvvel abroade in the Colleges, as at home amongſt the Prieſts that labored in the Engliſch vineyard, vverre happily gouerned & manured.* vvhat deceit, ſhift, or falſhood finde you in theſe ſpeeches? Doeth the Author envie the Card. iuſt titles? dare he deny that all vvent vvel ſo long as that bleſſed man gouerned? he ſeemeth ſo to doo, els knovve I not vvhy he shold reckone vp theſe ſpeeches amongſt *deceite, ſhiftes, & falshoods.* hovve ſoeuer they glorie of the Card. novv dead; yet commit they no falshood nor deceipt in the vvoordes by you alleaged. By the ſame vvoordes they ſecretlye inferre that theſe contentions brake out after his death, and not in his life. vvhich is ſo true that you your ſelues confeſſe it in 3. ſeue rall places of your Apol. This my brethren is to plaie at ſmallgame rather then to ſitt out. but rather then you vvould not thaue them noted of falshood, you vvil accuſe them of true and orderly ſpeeches, as fondly you doe in this preface for deceit & falshood. *Fol.* 6. 48. 6. 65. 6.

The 7. *Deſudantibus*, &c. *vvhile the ſeminarie Prieſts did thus ſvveat in the haruеſt of Ingland (vvhich haruеſt vvas then vvel manured & almoſt ripe) ſomme Ieſuits vvere called in by* *Pag.* 7.

D. Allen to helpe them, vvhoſe intentiõ vvas that they (the Ieſuits) ſhould be ayders, helpers, & fellovve laborours vvith the Prieſts in our lords vvorke.

this vvhole Narration you ſaie, hath many falshoods and vanities. let vs ſee one. Mary, hovve vvel manured and ripened vvas the Inglish Cath. harneſt 22. yeares ago, vvhen the *Ieſuits* vvear ſent firſt in? I anſvveare: So vvell as it hath beene at any time ſince, for the ſpace of time, and the nomber of the vvorkemen. you ſay, noe. and I ſay, yes. you talke of 22. yeares manuring by the trauell of 400. Prieſts and Ieſuits to helpe them. and I talke of 5. yeres ſpace onely, and of 100. and odd vvorkemen, If the Prieſts in that tyme had not manured it vvel and brought it to ſomme repenes, vvhere had the Ieſuits found harbor or hovvſes to receiue them, or men to mainteine them in that order they vveare mainteined? it vvas the ſecular Prieſts that brought them into honor and credit, and this thanke they haue for it. vvho is ſo blinde, that dooth not ſee by this place, that the Author of this Apol. is a Ieſuit, attributing to him ſelf and his, the manuring and ripenes of our English harueſt: and that 2. Ieſuits (although othervviſe learned & vertuous men) could doo more good to the ripening of the harueſt, then a 100. ſeminarie Prieſts: this in deede is both falshood and vanitie. But let vs examine your

brethrens vvords, and ſee vvhat falshood and vanitie they haue committed. They ſaie, that the *ſeminarie Prieſts did ſvveat in the harueſt of England before the Ieſuits came* in. yf the falshood be in that there vvere ſeminarye Prieſts in England before the fathers vvent in? I can aſſure you there vvere ſomme for v, yeares ſpace before the fathers entred. and that there vvere at the leaſt a hundreth before they vvent in. *M. Barlovve* beinge the firſt ſeminarye Prieſt that entred, can teſtifie ſo much. So can the R. Archp. and diuers of his aſſiſtantz vvhoe had beene in Ingl: ſomme yeares before the fathers. Is the falshood or vanitie in that they ſay: *they ſvvet in the harueſt*? yf the ſuffering impriſonement and cloſe impriſonement and martyrdoome (as ſomme of them had done before the coming of the Ieſuits) loſſe of goods and libertie, may not be termed ſvveating? then I confeſſe they haue committed falshood and vanitie for ſaying ſo. But lyeth the falshood and vanitie in that they ſay: *there vvas a harueſt then in Ingland?* O vanitie of vanitie! o blindnes! o shameles vvriter! are theſe falſhoods? are theſe vanities? are they not the verie ſolid Truth it ſelfe? vvhat poore Prieſts are you to vvrite againſt your ovvne knovvlege, and againſt your ovvne conſciences, vntruth? væ vobis that ſay: darkenes is light and light darkenes. But peraduenture there

is falshood and vanitie in the vvordes follovving: *vvhich harueſt vvas then vvell manured & almoſt ripe, ſomme Ieſuits vveare called in by D. Allen to helpe them.* vvhy? vvas it not vvel manured? vvere not men tanght to leave hanting and frequenting hereticall ſeruice? did not the Prieſts preache and teach, ſay Maſſe and adminiſter the Sacramentes? you vvil ſay peraduenture the falshood or vanitie is in the vvord *vvel*, becauſe nothing is vvel done, but that vvhich the Ieſuits doe. and by conſequence, before they appeered in the vvorld, there vvas nothing done vvel. Is the falshood in *Almoſt ripe?* yea forſooth. and vvhy ſo? bicauſe nothing can be ripened, but hy the Ieſuits. vvhere they comme, all is ripe incontynent. Is it a falshood or vanitie to ſaie, that *ſomme Ieſuits vvere called in to helpe them by D. Allen?* vvhy, all the vvorld knovveth this to be truth: and I vvonder hovve the Authot of this Apol. is ſo shameles, either to deny it, or compt it a falshood or vanitie. Let fa: par: call to memorie, that vvhich I ſett dovvne in theſe notes of D. Allens going vp to Rome, and he muſt needes beare vvitnes, that D. Allen procured the ſending in of the Ieſuits into Ingland, and that to helpe the Prieſts that trauelled there. By this you hane proued your ſelues both falſyfiers and vaine men: to extenuat your ovvne trauells and labours, and to-

Fol. 13.

geue the praiſe thereof to others that then deſerued them not. But let vs novve ſee your ovvne falshoods and vanities.

Firſt your ſaie: that There vvere but fevve Prieſts in Jngland.vvere a hundred Prieſts but a fevve? and that theare vvere a hundred, I can shevve out of the Regiſter of the yeares they vvent in, and of their names. it follovveth: *as hauing had but one onely Seminarie vntill that tyme the Jeſuits vvent in:* if this be falshood or no, let the Reader Indge. The Rom. Seminarie vvas inſtituted (as you confeſſe) in the yeare 1578. the Ieſuits vvent *Fol. 3.* firſt into Ingland in the yere 1580. about mid ſommer: ſo that that Colledge had beene founded at the leaſt 2. yeres before. and yet there vvas but *one onely ſeminarie till that tyme* and ſo by an *arithmeticall ſubſtraction*, of 2. you make but one. and that the Reader may better perceiue, this to be a notorions falshood: Diuers Prieſts vveerre ſent out of the rō. Colledge in to Ingl. before the Ieſuits vvēt thither: as *M. Sher martyr, M. Haddok, Array, Hide, & Meredeth. And fevve knovvne Catholicks.* this is indeede a vanitie. vvhere (I praie you vvere all theſe ſeminarie Prieſts beſides the old Prieſts, vvhich vvere then many in nōber, receuied ād harbored? by heretickes or ſchiſmatickes by like. vvhere (I praie you vvere the fathers receiued and almoſt a hundred Prieſts that entred the yeares 1580.

and 1581? if there vvere then *but fevve knovvne Catholicks* ? I confeſſe the nomber then vvas not like to the nomber that vvas aftervvards, and to that that is novve: bicauſe tyme and nomber of vvorkemen, haue gayned more. And this that I haue ſaid is knovvne to moſt men that knovve our caſe, and for this your miſdemeanor are to lament our comon caſe and cauſe.

The 8. *Oſtentans*, &c. *A certaine Ieſuit vanting him ſelfe among our people as though he had beene Legat to the ſee Apoſtolike*, &c. It maie be their vanitie is in ſaying *he vanted himſelfe to be*, &c. but ſure I am in fact and deed he vſed the Authoritie of a legat in aſſembling *Synodes* vvhich you confeſſe, and ſay that neither D. Allen nor fa. pa. did allovve of it. *Fol.164. b.* vvherein lyeth then the falshood in theſe vvords? for ſooth, that he did not vant himſelfe, &c. but in truth and in act as you your ſelues confeſſe, he plaied the Legat. it is not then a material but a verbal falshood, ſuch as you commit full many in this your Apol. And to prooue this falshood, your ſaie it is ſpoken *of fa: Hayvvood, a graue and learned man* as all men knovve: as vvho should ſay *a graue and learued man* cannot be ambitious, or ſynne in ambition, or as though all Ieſuits vveare Angels and ſainctes, and cannot be ambitious, or commite the like ſynnes. I vvould to God they vveare, for then this la-

mentable diuiſion had neuer happened in our contrey. Novve vvhere you referre vs to the thirde chap. of your book, and to the 11. chap. to ſee *hovve falſe and malitious this lye is, vvith diuers others vttered againſt him.* I haue reade ouer very diligenth your 3. chap. and find no vvord there, of fa. Hayvv. at all. Is not this then, a flat lye) to vſe your ovvne termes) to ſay you shevve in ſuch a place *hovve falſe and malicious the lie is*, vvhere you make no mention at all of it? except vnder the generall name of Ieſuits (vvhome you defend in that chap.) your Reader muſt conieƈture that you defend fa. Heyvv, particularly in the 11. Chap. you ſay: *And as for that biting florish brought in pag. 8. againſt fa: Heyvv. that he did vant & brag in Ingland, as legat of the ſee Apoſtolick, called a prouinciall Counſell, abrogated the vigils and faſts of our lady, prohibited th' Acts of our Martyrs vvritten by D. Allen, they are partly plaine Calumniations, and partly odius and malitious vvreſting of his dooings.* vvell, touching the vvord *vant and bragg*, I am content, lett them be a Calumniation, for albeit they peraduenture can prooue it, yet cannot I. hovve ſay you? is that alſo a Calumniation, that he called a Prouinciall Synode, that he vvoulde haue abrogated the faſts of your ladye, that he hindred and letted the Acts of our Martyrs to be published? ſpeake out? if you affirme it to be a Calumniation, then you con- *Fol. 164. b.*

demne your ſelues, for in this place you confeſſe that *it is true, that 16. or 17. Prieſts mett together*, behold the *Synode. that they vvould haue had all the nationall cuſtomes of Ingland about faſting, to be reduced to the Common order of the Rom. Church.* and vvhat is this, but to abrogat the faſts of our ladye in Ingland. and you confeſſe that D. Allen and fa. par. and others did not allovve thereof. Tell me in your larger Apol. in vvhich vvord of theirs conſiſteth this Calumniation, *odious & malicious vvreſting of his dooing*? vvhen as you your ſelues confeſſe, all they ſaie to be true, and his dooings to be disliked by D. Allen and fa. par. hovve haue you shevved in this chap. hovve falſe and malicious this lye is? you are poore Prieſts, vnited in falshood and mallice againſt your innocent brethren. they ſay the truth, you doo confeſſe it, and yet your Reader muſt needs beleeue and thinke, that in the places by you quoted, they may ſee hovve falſe and malicions a lye is made againſt fa: Heyvv. a graue and lerned man. and yet ſuch is your impudencie, that in one place you ſay neuer a vvord of it, and in they other, you confeſſe all and more too then your aduerſarie dooth ſay. you knovve vvho aduertiſeth that in accuſing honeſt men ought to be preciſe and punctuall. Can there be greater accuſations then to committ *a falſe and malicious lie?* then to be *Odious*

Fol. 190.

and

and malicius vvresters of mens dooings? these be your Accusations. you are taken for honest men, therefore you ought to haue beene precise and punctuall in your prooffes. but vvhat tell I you of prooffes? for you haue svvorne as it seemeth in this your Apol. to say vvhat you list, but not to proue auy thing at all.

The 9. toucheth the Rectors gouernemēt of the College: my opinion touching that you shall finde in these notes.

Pag. ibid. *Conspectis, &c.* vvhere is reported that D. Allē vvas vvōt to say, that the fathers sought more their ovvne good then that of their Coutrey or the Colledge. you answere, it is meere false and a notorious vntruth. hovve doo you make, or prooue it a notorious vntruth? you referre vs to his letters in the 4. Chapt. and for any thing in those lettres, he might haue said somuch. you referre vs to your 11. Chapt. vvhere you haue these vvordes: *All that they tell after this of* Card. *Allen from pag. 6. that he fauored them or misliked the Jesuits, or concurred vvith these factions & their emulations aganist them, is refuted largely before in the 3. and 4. Chap. of this treatise.* vvell, in the tvvo chapters you allege heere, this saying is not prooued *meere false or an notarious vntruth.* let vs see the 3. Chapt. I hane read it diligently ouer vvhith my spectacles, and finde Card. Allen once onelye named in it. Fol. 15. Fol. 164. Fol. 24.

but no one lettre of his in that chapt. to the vvhich yet you ſend vs. you ſay there, that the Ieſuits procured the firſt 100. Crovvnes for the ſeminary of Dovvay, as the vvorld knovveth and Card. Allen did allvvayes confeſſe vvhile he vvas living. ergo by Card. Allens ovvne letters and dooings this report is meere falſe and a notarious vntruth, ſuch comonlye are your prooffes throghout your Apol. vvell for all you haue ſaid as yet to the contrarie it may be true vvhich they report of Card. Allen. I doo not ſay it is true. but for any thing you ſay or bring here or elsvvhere to improoue it, it may be true.

You aske, *vvhat priuat good can the Ieſuits pretend for them ſelues vvorth their labours & perils in Ingland except the good of ſoules* ? they haue anſvveared you and ſtill doo: that the Ieſuits ſeeke to rule the roſte, to haue all mé at their beck and commandement, to haue nothing doon vvhithout their aduice and appointement and that they vvil haue all Prieſts their Prentizes. thus they anſvvere the queſtion, but hovve true, Time vvill hevve.

And vvhere you aske: *of vvhat conſciẽce then are theſe men that print ſo manifeſt Calumniations*? I anſvver: of the ſame conſcience you are, vvhich print and in this Table, haue imputed deceipt, falshoods, vntruthes, manifeſt lyes and Calumniations vnto them, vvhen

there is no ſuch thing, as hath beene shevved. Looke into your ovvne conſciences firſt and clenſe them, and then aske hardlye, vvith vvhat conſcience your Brethren can print ſuch manifeſt calumniations, after you haue prooued them ſuch: other vviſe, you doo but dally in vvoords, and vvith exclamations abuſe your. Reader.

The 10. pag. 11. it is the 10. *Iam tu*, &c. you nippe their vvords, for thus they ſaie to his Hol: *At that time both the College, and all the ſchollers had beene vndoonn if youe hol. had not ſent Card: Tolledo, vvho after he had heard both parties & iudged the Controuerſy vvhith equall, ballance oppoſed himſelf as a vvall for the schollers, our contrey being deſtituteof Card. Allen their father.* you haue nipped of, *that he vvas ſent by his Hol. to be a Iudge in the Cauſe.* by vvhich your Readers might perceiue that Card. Tolledo ſeeindg the ſchollers to haue right on their ſide, ſtood vvhith them and for them all his life. he vvas not then a fauorer of troubleſome and ſeditious ſchollars againſt their ſuperiors as you vvould inferre, but a patron and defender of the youthes from the vniuſt dealings and gouuernemēt of their ſuperiors, and that ſent by his Hol. as they ſay and you confirme by nipping of theſe vvords: *miſsus. à tua S.*

The 11. pag. ibid. *VVhiles theſe things, vvere a dooing in Rome, the troubles of vvisbich*

Fol. 6. *began, &c.* Doo you not ſay ſo much your ſelues, vvhere you ioyne the troubles of the Rom. Colledge, of ſlaunders, and vvisbich Caſtle together? but vvhere is the deceipt, shift, and falshood of theſe ſpeeches? *for this cauſe you haue thought it conuenient to note ſome points touching their vntruthes, &c.* vvhy did you putt dovvne theſe vvords, can you tell? No ſuerlye, but onely to make vpp a nomber.

Ju tabul. apologiæ.

The 12. you vvill your Reader to note the phraſe of *United.* and vvhy could they not name them ſelues the vnited Prieſts? you anſvver: bicauſe they vvere farre the leſſer nomber. a good reaſon. a fevve in nomber cannot be vnited, or ſo termed. vvhere vvere your vvitts? Nay, (ſay your) beſids this, they vvere deuided ſtom their head. hovve could a companie that haue no hedd, be deuided from their hedd? for the Arch. vvas not then their hedd, but an vſurper, and an intruded perſon, till the Popes breue came, as is prooued at large in theſe notes. ſeeing there vvas no hedd, there could be no bodye. and ſo could they not be deuided from the reſt of their bodye the English Clergie. you ſeeke very narrovvly and are deſirous of contention, that hunt ſo after vvords and ſyllables, and yet vvhen you haue all ſaid, they might be iuſtly vnited Prieſts, not as the vnited Prouinces

Fol. 47. b.

terme them ſelues, for they have a hedd, the king and Gouernor. theſe had none in Ingland, that vvas their ſuperior, nor out of Ingland, but his Hol. onely.

All that vvhich followveth, till you comme to the 18. are matters of ſtorie and fact, and therefore to be omitted by me, and to be anſvvered by the Actors.

The 18. youreprehend them for their aſſociation and chooſing to them ſelues Prelats, beiug but a fevve and that they vvould doe it *vvhout Comiſsion aud conſent of the reſt of the Clergie or vvhithout licence of their Superior.* hovve and vvith vvhat face can you reprehend 13. Prieſts (for you graunt they vveare ſo many in vvisbich, beſids thoſe that vveare at libertie and of their aſſociation) for chooſing of Prelats, vvhen you haue had a prelat given you by the information of 2. Ieſuitz and one ſecular Prieſt onely, and that vvithout commiſſion and conſent of the reſt of the Clergie. vvhich is the greater fault and greater abſurditie, for ſecular Prieſts to thinke of chooſing themſelues Prelats (for as yet they vvere not comme to the choice) or for Religious men to meddle vvithout Commiſſion to procure a hedd to the ſecular Clergie, vvithout their knovvlege or conſent.

That vvhich you add: *VVithout the licence of their ſuperior* is a meere fitton. for

they tell you pag. 23. *Si quando id (B. Pater) tibi approbandum videretur.* to vvhome not the election (by ordinarie lavve) but the confirmation apperteyneth they might then lavvfully chooſe their Prelatz vvithout licence of any ſuperiors, but they are to be confirmed by the ſuperior before they can adminiſtdrat and exerciſe their dignitie or offyce. The Reſt of the Articles, touch not the Controuerſie, but the eſtimation of perticular perſons, vvhome I deeme to be vnduly and vncharitably both named and taxed, and there fore leave it to their ſatisfaction, vvhich they are in my Iudegement bound to make, and that in print.

I muſt yet aduertize thee (gentle Reader) of an egregious vntruth before I make an end that is: vvhere this Author ſaith in theend of his table, that he vvill not cite any thing out of the English booke, *becauſe he hath examined the ſame ſufficiently in the* 1. 2. 7. *&* 11. Chap. marke (Reader) vvhen thou commeſt to thoſe places hovve ſufficently he hath examined it. there it ſhalbe shovved thee, that he hath left the cheif points and Reaſons thereof, both vnanſvvered and vnexamined.

But you ſay: *it may be ſomme other vvill examine more exactly theſe bookes.* indeede ſo he hath neede, for you hane examined

them as lightlie and as ſlenderly as any man vvell could doo . Yf fearefull fleeing from the Truth, anſvvearing to no one Reaſon, and filling your Readers eares vvith tittle tattle, be an exact examination. and as you conclude , this vvill in deede be ſufficient for him that vvill not take the peaynes to Reade your Apol. but to beleeue you or your vvord. but to him that vvill reade it vvith care and diligence and ſeeke on vvhich ſide the Truth lieth, the ſame vvill prooue verie inſufficient and not vvoorthie the name of an Apologie, vvhich is a defence of truth : and ſo ſhall ſee to your *Confuſion of countenance* hovve poorely, faintly, and vveakly you defend your *Eccliaſtical Hierarchie* ſett vp and iuſtituted by a Card. Protectors letters. And for an end of this table, I muſt aduertiſe thee (Reader) that the Prieſts haue printed another booke in Latin dedicated to the *Inquiſition* , in vvhich they hane ſimplie and plaiuly ſett dovvne the controuerſie, and haue not roved therein at bymatters, nor touched the name or fame of any parſon in perticular or in generall : to the vvhich booke, theſe men are ſo farre from anſvvearing, as they doo not once name it , or make mention of it, in this their breif Apol. I knovve not vvhat they vvil doo in their more larger and ample vvhich they promiſe thee. and if the Prieſts

had kept them ſelues vvith in the compaſſe of their matter, in this booke ſent to his Hol. vvee had loſt this vvoorthy peece of vvoorke, the vvhich is vvritten in the defence of ſomme perticular men, and of the ſocietie, and not in defence of the Hierarchie, as they vntruly vvould make his Hol. beleeue. for, as I haue often ſayd, and muſt oftentymes hereafter note, the Authour neuer commeth neere the matter or the controuerſie. vvhich I muſt aduertize (the Reader) to note and mark diligently.

In the preface to the reader.

In the preface to the Reader, you are of a ſuddaine become very holie and charitable men. for thoſe vvhome a little before in the table you accuſed of *vntruthes, ſhifts, deceipes, falshoods, Calumniations, & ſlanders,* are novve forſooth your *moſt entierly beloued Brothren.* O hypocriſie! vvhen the fox precheth, bevvare your gheeſe, bevvare their gaule hidden vnder ſugred vvords. your Reader forſooth muſt thinke and beleeue that this Controuerſie vvhich is betvveene ſomme Prieſts, the Archprieſte and English Ieſuits, to be againſt the church of God and all good men: as though there vvere no good men, but ſuch as ſtand vvith the Archprieſt and Ieſuits, and as though they, made the church of Chriſt, or at leaſt vvere the principall menbers thereof. O follie! And vvhy may not that vvhich you bring

bring out of S. Cyprian touching the *later sort*, be applied to those, vvhome you take vpon you to defend. vvhoe vvere more troublesome then they? vvho began this contention and strife: but they? vveare not the Iesuits the cheif informeres and persvvaders of this subordination and that it should be instituted by the Protector and not by his Hol.? you confesse somuch your selues. vvas not fa: lister, the second cause of all this trouble by vvriting that booke, vvherein he vvould prooue them schismaticks, for not obaying the Protectors letters? his booke is printed *verbatim* in theirs to the Inquisition, the vvhich you doo not answeat. vvere not fa: Garnet and the Archp. mayneteyners and incensors of this trouble, by subscribing and authorizing that booke? you confesse it by your deepe silence in not refuting them vvhé they obiect it. vvas not the indiscreat letter and opinion of the Archp. the cause of this last breache, by vvriting and pronouncing them schismaticks for not receyuing him vpon the Protectors institution? they put *pag.* 63. dovvne his epistle in bothe the latin bookes, *pag.* 60. and his decree after their appellation. you slyly let all passe vvithout answver and yet vvill needs haue vs beleeue them, and not you, to be the Authors of all this trouble. You obiectt to them their association, they confesse it, and giue you the reasons vvhy *pag.* 21.

they made it. you accuſe them of the troubles in *Vvishich Caſtle*, they tell the Pope thereof, and put dovvne the ſtorie: (trulie or falſely, that is elſvvhere to be examined.) you accuſe them of diſobedience to their ſuperiors, the Protector and Archp. they proue and that by 11. reaſons al in rovve, that nether of them vvas their ſuperiors. You are dumbe, and anſvvere not any one of thoſe reaſons. you accuſe them of diſobedience, and contemptuous ſpeeches againſt his Hol. in diuers parres of theſe notes, you are shevved to ſpeake vntruly of them. you accuſe them, of all the factions and ſeditions, that haue beene betvvixt englishmen, in diuers contryes, euer ſince vvee haue liued in banishment, and yet ſomme of them vvere thē vnborne, and the greateſt part of them, but yong ſtvdients, vvhen thoſe diſſentions happened. Lett any in differēt reader iudge novv vvho haue beene theſe *trouble somme fellovves*, and apt to ſett debat, and of vvhome S. Cyprian talketh vvhether you diſcontented brethrē or thoſe in vvhoſe defence you vvritt this Apologie?

pag. 51.

You ſay full vvell (but you followve it not) *That ſcandall should haue vvitheld you from vvriting*. for hovv can it othervvize be, but you muſt contynue and maintayne ſcandall, vvhē you defende theſe that vveare the Authors of this ſcandall? your brethrē vveare vniuſtly

accuſed of ſchiſme, rebellion, contention, and ſedition, lo, the ſcandall giuen, they vvere forced to defend their name and fame by vvriting, and to prooue they vveare not ſchiſmatiks. you come on their backs vvith this Apol. doe you not mainteyne the ſcandall? I aske pardon: in deede you neuer come neere the marke, neither vvill you make mention of this ſchiſme, vvhich yet is the fundation of all this controuerſye. I knovve not *vvhat pointes your reader knovveth al readie*, but ſure I am, they are not like to knovve or perceiue any point that is in controuerſie by this your Apolog. I knovve they shalbe choked vvith the Rom. ſturres, G.G. his ſpieries, Paris factions, Flanders tumults, Fishers examinatiõs VViſbich contentions, praiſes of ſomme religious men, detractions of the diſcontented vvith heapes and bundles of priuat mens letters (vvhich you terme authenticall teſtimonies) from all coaſts, and ſomme of them (as by reading you may eaſely coniecture) intercepted, but none of them to the purpoſe. and at laſt (to make you merry) vvith *M. VVatſons* common vvelth. lo here, the ſubſtãce of this Apol. this if you knevve not before, you shall novv knovve & perceiue by this Ap. but yov shall not knovve all. vvhy ſo? Mary, much is kept for the larger Apol. vvhich shall out aſſone as the Informations comme aſvvell out of our contrey (to Rome vvhere the penner lieth) as other forraine Realmes. tys great

liklihood, that ſingular matters vvill be conteyned therein. for things farre fecht, are deinty.

You ſend out this your Apol. to *fore vvarne* and *forearme* men leſt, their books *infect the good and trouble the ſtrongeſt: vvhen they ſee ſuch enormous matter paſſe vvithout controulement.* ſuerly for any thing you ſay in this Apolog. touching the matter in queſtion, the good may contynue infected, if to hold and beleeue the Truth be infection, and not onely the ſtrõgeſt, may ſtand ſtill in his ſtrength: but alſo the vveaklings may be made ſtrong: as I doubt not but many vvill be, hauing read theſe notes: in the vvhich your vveakenes and nakednes is laid open to the ſight of all that be not vvilfully blinde. I knovve that by *enormious matter* heere you meane, not the queſtion in controuerſie, but either the vndecent ſpeeches they haue vttered againſt the ſocietie, orother particulars in their booke. tell them home for it hardly, and take them vpp bitterly, for they ſeeme to haue deſerned it: but doe not mock your Reader, and make him beleeue, that vnder theſe vvords, you comprehend the fact and matter betvveene you and your brethren in queſtion. for as I haue often inculcated, you come as neere the queſtion as *London* is to *Lincolne.*

If this I haue ſaid prooue true, then the

more graue and vviſer ſort of readers vvill conſider vvith them ſelues, of the iuſtice of the cauſe and of your iniquitie and vniuſt proceding, that make his Hol. and them beleene, you vvrite in defence of the Hierarchie, by him inſtituted: vvhereas you vvrite onely in defence of ſomme certaine men, defamed, and vncharitably vſed, by the penner of the Latin booke to his Hol. and not one vvord for the defence of the Hierarchie: vvhich you confeſſe your ſelues here ſo apparently, that a very Idiot may perceiue it. *The principall point* (you ſay) *that by anſvvearing you can note to thē is*: firſt the *Extreame paßions of theſe libellers* (note you vvrite againſt their paſſions, and not in defence of the *Hierarchie*) *in deſcending to ſuch kind of reuenge, if they had beene iniuried*. againſt this reuenge then, you reuenge your ſelues, and care full little for the matter in queſtion.

If they had beene iniuried, quothd you) vvhy, can there be a greater iniurie offred to catholick Prieſtes, that imploy their trauaill in an hereticall cōtrey, vvith the hazard of their liues, to vvith dravve and reclaime others from hereſie and ſchiſme, then to be called, compted, published, pronounced, and by vvritten bookes prooued to be ſchiſmaticks them ſelues, yea to be men vvorſe then vvytches ſoothſayers, pagans, and Idolaters? doe you not knovve thus much? hovve can

See fa. Liſters booke. § 7.

you be ignorant of it? if you knovve it, vvith vvhat braſen face, dare you vvrite to english-men, and Cath. men, *If they had beene iniuried?* vvhere is your conſciéce? nay vvhere is you charitie? are you vvorthie the names of confeſſors, or of Prieſts either, that ſo impudétly in print, ād to English Catholickes, that knevve full vvell, they vvere called and counted ſchiſmatikes, you dare ſay *If they had beene iniuried?* Reade the greiuous punishments enacted againſt Schiſmatikes, ſett dovvne in fathers Liſters booke, and you shall ſee vvhither they vvere iniuried or no, by being eſteemed, held, and called ſchiſmatikes. You goe on: *the moſt bitter and opprobious ſtile of ſpeeche* this then, and not the matter in controuerſie hath ſturred you vp to vvrite, and to reuenge. *and theſe*, (as you note in your mergent) *are the points to be conſidereed in the libels ſett forth.* Mark (Reader) is it not true I haue oft told thee, that theſe vnited prieſts, doe neither defend, nor touch the matter in controuerſie, but onely defend the name and eſtimation of certeine perſons, bitten vvith this *bitter and opprobious ſtile and ſpeeche*. I doe not finde fault vvith them therefore: but am ſorie they abuſe his Hol. and you english catholickes, in making you beleeue, that this their Apolog. vvas vvritten, in defence of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie: vvhen it is vvritten in the defence of particular men onelie, and againſt *con-*

tumelious libelling and vvriting, vvherein vvorthy men are defamed. Not a vvord of the Hierarchie. you should haue shevved that the Archp. vvas lavvfully and dulie instituied, by a Card. letters, vvithout the Popes buls. you should haue prooued the discontéted to haue beene scismatikes, for vvithstanding and not receiuing the Archp. vpon those letters: you should haue answvered the Reasons, they bring in defēce of their dooings: you should haue controvvled them, for denying the Protector or. the Archp. to be their superior you should haue declared, that the Arch. did duly and lavvfully, pronounce them schismatikes for not receyving him vpō the Card. letters, yea after they had yeelded to the Popes buls: these are the questions in cōtrouersie, these are the points vvhich the more *graue and vviser sort ought to consider of.* these are the *points to be considered in the libels set forth.* but in these points you are so dombe, and flie so vvillinglie from them, that I am ashamed (for your sakes) of your covvardlines.

you add: *no certaine author, &c.* of this point I haue talked in these notes, little to your credit.

I hope and presume vvith you *that euerie discreet reader vvill of himself novve ponder both your points,* and the others that I haue laid dovvne, and thereby iudge, hovve vvell you defend the matter in controuersie in this your Apol.

And vvithall vvill consider *VVhat manner of men these be you vvrite against*, and hovve they haue aduentured, backed by the lavves, Canons and cõstitutions of the Church, to vvithstande iustlie, lavvfully, and in conscience, the intrusion of the Archp. thrust vpon them by a Card. letters, against all lavve, iustice, and practise of Gods Church. By this that hath beene said, and is hereafter in these notes to be said, the reader shall easely see, vvho are the *authors of so intollerable a scandall in our English Church*, and hovve impudently vvithout all kynde of proof or shevve of proffe, these vnited Priests vvould thrust it from the true Authors vpon innocent men.

your Conclusion then is, that this brief Apol. (being sent out as a cock boat before the great ship your larger Apol.) *is vvritte for the honor of our nation* (but to the little honor of the Author) and for *somme defence of innocencie exceedinglie iniuried in these vvritings*. so, as I said before, this is not a defence of the Hierarchie but of priuate men, vvhich pretend thẽ selues to be iniuried, and so you may haue *a confused countenance* for promising his Hol: cheese, and giue him in steade thereof Chaulke.

you vaunt, that you haue vvritten this Apol. *in a far other style then the Authors of these bookes haue:* lett the Reader iudge. I beleeue he shall finde as *bitter a style and as opprobrious speeches* in this your Apol. and that vvorthy men

are

are (if not defamed) yet taunted, as bitterly by name, as thothers are in whoſe defence they write.

But you promiſſe a larger Apol. which shal be more *ſubſtantiall and authentick*. where fore? bicauſe you will haue informations and letters, not onely out of our contrey, but alſo from *forraine realmes*. as who should ſay, that priuat mens letters, eſpecially of the aſſiſtāts and of ſuch as are creatures or fautors of the Ieſuits, are to be accompted, of any graue or wiſe man, either ſubſtantiall or authentick, mary, if you bring vs the ſignes and publick ſeales of Princes, or citties, then I will hold with you, and call them anthentick, other wiſe to thinke your Reader will take priuat letters for ſubſtantiall and authentick matter is to thinke him to be a verie fole and an aſſe.

Well, you will get *informations, letters, and other vvritings concerning this affaire*. which affaire I praie you? to defend the inſtitution and ſubordination of the Archp. made by the Card. letters? there is no neede of other writinge to proue that, but by the canons, the interpretors, and the Gloſſe. other writinges are of no forſe in this point. or is it to prooue your *moſt entierly beloued Brethren* to haue beene Schiſmaticks, for not receyuing him? I am ſuer you can doe no more, nor ſay more in that point, then ſa. Liſter hath doue. or is it to prooue that the Archp. receiued a letter

from the mother cittie by which he was aduiſed to hold them for Schiſmaticks after they hadd obayed the Popes bull, for with ſtanding the Card. letters? this matter your beloued brethren haue committed to the inquiſition to iudge and reſolue, to whome and not to any priuat letters, the deciſion apperteyneth. Or to be short, will you bring *authenticall informacion* to proue that the Protector of Ingland hath power or iuriſdiction, vpon Inglishmen, in Ingland or out of Inglād? this in deede were a worke worthie ſuch wnited hedds. But in truth, this affaire, is the defence of the name and credit of ſomme that haue beene vncharitably bitten by your brotherne and nothing els. you haue wearyed vs alredie, with your Romaine ſturres, Paris ād Flanders factions, Giffords and Gratlies bookes, ſa. Weſtons praiſes, Wiſbiches troubles, fishers memorial and examinatiōs, Watſons common welthe, and with a great bundle of tedions letters. for the loue of God no more. But if you will be doing, touch the points in controuerſie, twang vpō that ſtring: shoote at the marke, and riun not a rouing, as you haue doon in this: otherwiſe you will looſe, both your paines, coſtes, and creditt: and of this I warne you as a frend, and as one that wisheth yout honor, and your quietnes. for if you ſett *dovvne things at length*, in your next in that order, and after that fashion you haue

doon heere: certaynly, both thoſe that liue preſently, and the poſteritie after vs, will wonder to ſee howe God hath blinded you, and left you to your fantaſies, and made you to pronounce your ſelues, to be the cheife diſturbers in this cauſe, to impugne the Canons and conſtitutions of the Church, and not to decide, but to run quite from the Cõtrouerſie nowe in hand. Beſides I pronoſticate vnto you, that if in your next you giue not better *ſtayes and ſtoppes then in this: the diuers good mẽ vvho vrged you to vvrite and at vvhoſe requeſte,* you haue published this booke, if they haue ſo much witt as goodnes in thẽ: will not onely be ſorie to haue requeſted you to write ſo foolishlie: but alſo, will quitt you, and pronounce you to haue more care to write againſt the *intemperat manner of proceedinge*, of your brethren, then to defend the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie, inſtituted by the Card. letters, as in your Epiſtle you promiſed his Hol. Well, when theſe informations come from ſo farre contreyes, I doubt not, but they wilbe veiwed and ſifted, as wel as theſe are, that came not ſo farre. and then the Readers will weigh and conſider, which ſide writeth, *Vvithout all regard of truth and modeſtie*, and on which ſide the truth lieth and leanethe.

In the meane tyme, till your other be redie to ſucceede I shall deſire the reader to perviſe this diligently, and to conferre theſe

my notes there with: whereby they shall ſee, howe you are bound to doe that, you wish your brethren heere to doe, that is, chriſtianly to correct your ſelues, confeſſe and ſatisfie for the faults, you haue committed, in ſlandering and calumniating them, for ſuch faultes (I ſay) as your owne conſciences shall accuſe you of, and then to amend & correct all the faulte I note herein againſt you. For if it pleaſed God to giue you this ſpirit of humilitie, this controuerſie would quickly be at an end, ād all should be in order and quiet againe. And as you wish your brethrē to doe in reſpect of them, whome they haue iniuried or infamed, ſo doe I wish and exhort them to it, as they are bound in conſcience to doe. and you to doe the like againe on your part: you (I ſay) my vnited brethren, or whoſoeuer (be he Religious or prieſt) that is Author of this Apologie. for your ſo dooing, the Angels in heauen will reioyce, all mē will be thereof full gladd, the common enemy shalbe confounded, the harueſt at home, wilbe better cultiued, Gods glorie wilbe augmented, loue and amitie betweene brethren wilbe encreaſed, infinit Soules wilbe gayned, your old glorie and renowne recouered, and all ſtrifes, troubles, and controuerſies remooued, and forgotten, yea and many a one of you with martyrdoome for this hūblenes crowned. but if you go on as you ha-

ue begune, and as you seeme to continue, the contrarie of all this will happen, to your dishonor and discredit in this world, and to your shame at the dredfull day of iugement. God of his infinit goodnes mollifie your stonie harte, open your eyes, make you yeeld to the truthe, and in the end bring you, your brethren, your Readers, and my self to his eternall blisse. Amen.

CHAP. I.

THe firſt fault I find vvith you (vnited Bretherne) is that by vvriting of this Apologie, you blovve (as it vvere) the trumpett to an nevv onſett, as men deſirous to continevve in vvrangling and diſſention ſtill, and prouoking your diſcontented brethrene to breake their ſilence, for their ovvne defence: by vvhich doing you haue not only broken Charitie (vvhich in ſuch a nombre as you be, shoulde more abounde, then in a leſſer nomber, not ſo vvell vnited as you are) but alſo highly diſobaied his hólines commandement (vvhich diſobedience you oft obiect in this your Apologie, to your brethrene) vvho in his laſt bull ſent into Ingland for the pacification of theis contentions, forbadde all bookes vvritten on both ſides, to be read of any vvith in Ingland, or others to be vvritten, vnder paine of excommunication. If you (vnited bretherne) be herein obedient childrene? let all men that haue either ſeene or heard thereof, be Iudges.

Beſides that, you might very vvell haue ſpared his labour, for you doe nothing in all this your booke, but rove vp and dovvne vvith by and impertinēt matters, neuer touching or comminge neare the prick: filling vp your booke novv vvith old quarrells, apperteining neither to the matter you vvrit of nor to the men you vvrite againſt: then, vvith letters, examinations, and other ttifles (as thoſe of M. vvatſons deuiſes) not vvorth the labor (certz) of ſuch men as you are, and much leſſe vvorthe the reading of any vviſe, graue or learned reader as in place shalbe noted.

The ſecond fault I find, is vvith the title or inſcription of your firſt chapter (imitating herein your ſelues, vvho find fault vvith the title of the latin booke, but hovviuſtly, shalbe shovved in his place) vvhich you haue put dovvne in generall termes and yet in deed do proue nothing at all of that vvhich you pretend. So as it may vvell be ſaid of this title, as our Lavviers often times ſay of our Rubrickes, viz, that *Rubrica eſt generalior nigro*, the Rubrick (or title) is more generall and ample then the text. yon ſay: The emulation of ſecular priſtes againſt religious: bothe theiſe vvord ſecular priſtes and Religious being put dovvne indefinitly, that is generally, for in lavve *Indefinitum æquiparatur vniuerſali.* An indefinite propoſition, is equall to a vniuerſall

propoſition. So that you ſay thus,(if you ſay any thinge) The emulation of all ſecular prieſtes againſt all ſortes of religious men, hath brought great hurte to Ingland. And all your proſes yet are but of ſome ſecular prieſtes, againſt other ſecular prieſts and religious. And whē you haue all done, ād come to the pointe of this controuerſie, you grant it is the emulation of 13. prieſtes, (brought afterwards to 7.) againſt their fellow prieſtes, and one Ieſuit. and elswhere you confeſſe againe, that this emulation is but of ſomme fewe ſecular prieſtes againſt the fathers.

By this generalitie of ſpeach then, you doe not only accuſe your ſelues, (for you are alſo ſecular prieſts but do alſo drawe me and others with in the compaſſe of this emulation, who were neuer of the one nor of th' other faction, but haue hitherto and ſo will ſtill keepe our ſelues indifferēt and free, from paſſion or affection to either ſide, in this ſo pitifull and ſlanderous diſſention.

Now as touching Religious. all this emulation is but againſt one order of Religious viz: the fathers of the Society, as you confeſſe throughout the whole booke, and ſo it muſt needes be, bicauſe there are not many in Ingland of any other order. Thus then you ſhould haue intitled your chapter: *vvhat great hurt hath come to Ingland by emulation of the laytie againſt the Cler-*

gie, and of a fevv ſecular Prieſtes againſt other ſecular Prieſtes, and the Religious of the Societie of Iheſus. For other emulation then this, your doe not proove, either in this chapter, or in the vvhole booke it ſelf: I feare much that the vnited Prieſtes, are not the Authors of this booke, for that I cannot iudge ſo hardly of them, that to extoll, praiſe, and defend the ſocietie and ſome certaine perſones of the ſame, they vvould ſo farre forgett them ſelues, as to accuſe men of their ovvne coate and order, of ſo hainons a crime, as not only in our daies, but from the beginning of Chriſtianitie in our contrey, the emulation of ſecular Prieſtes againſt Religious should bring great hurts to our Nation: Out vpon ſuch baſe Prieſtes, as ſo vniuſtly and vncharitably, accuſe them ſelues and theirs, to pleaſe others, out vpon ſuch vnnaturall birds, that defile their owne neſtes, by ſlaundering their owne vocation in words without any profs, as anone shalbe shewed.

In an other place, to a baſe and bring in to contempt, your owne order and vocation, you ſay: That the greater parte of you were ſerving men, ſouldiers and wandrers. but to be plaine with you, I do not thinck that any ſecular Prieſtes would be ſo iniurious and vngratfull to this order and vocation. And therfore I thincke ſome religious man hath borrowed your names, the

better therby to extoll his religion, and companions, and to abaſe and bring into contempt, both with layty and Clergie, the ſtate of ſecular Prieſtes: to thend he may ſo reveng him ſelf, of ſome of them his aduerſaries, and ſo for the fault of a few to offer injury to the reſt. This is no noveltie, for the report goeth of a religious man, that borrowed M. Dolmans name, (a ſecular Prieſte in a booke dedicated to the Earle of Eſſex, when he was in his ruffe: the which trick, as it brought that Prieſt, into ſome danger then, ſo this toy is like to bring you (the vnited Prieſtes) into disfavour, miſlick and diſcredite, with all well meaning and vnpaſſionated men, both Prieſtes and lay: to ſee you ſo farre from all love and charitie towards your bretherne, that you are made not only, inſtruments to vexe and diſcredite them, but alſo Authors, to renewe, and proclaime the warre a freash againſt them, with fire and ſworde, which will fall out but little to your owne creditt.

If you do iuſtly miſlike the diſcontented bretherne, for touching the whole bodie of the Ieſuits, you haue to pardon me, if I miſlike with you in touchinge ſo generally, the body of the ſecular Priſtes, where of I am a member. But lett vs ſee firſt wherein the ſeculer Priſtes haue emulated the Religious with ſo great hurt to Ingland? Sure it muſt

be that they envied them, for their lands and livings, for their Iurisdiction and authoritie, or for their liues and behaviours. Now touching the first twoe, it is well knowen our secular Clergie in England, to haue had such honorable meanes to live, as they had litle cause to envie the religious herein. besides who knoweth not the authoritie, and Iurisdiction of secular Priestes, to hane bene farre greater, then that of any religions order: yea to haue extended it self, over the Religious them selues. And as for the last point, the Prieſtes are so farre (especially in this age) from envying the lives and maners of the Societie in speciall, that Iam assured, and all men will confesse, more secular Prieſtes to haue entred, and daily doe enter, into the Societie alone, then into all the other orders of Religion, putt them all together. If you knowe any other cause why the Prieſtes should envie them, let me vnderstand it, for my learning in your larger Appologie, for sure Iam that in this Apologie you haue not as yet prooved, that the secular Prieſtes haue emulated the Religious, either in any of the foresaid 3. pointtes, or in any other point els what so euer. *Nowv to your examples.*

The first is of Ihon of Gant, which prooveth only this, that there was (for that Prince his sake) Emulation of some secular Prieſtes, against the 2. Bishopps there named, and the

reſt of the ſecular Prieſtes, and Religious, that tooke their parte as it is now betwene ſome ſecular Prieſts ād the Archprieſt, which the reſt of the Prieſtes and Ieſuites that hold with him. Doth this proove the emulation of the ſecular Prieſts in generall againſt the Religious in generall? and yet very likly it is, that the kniges vncle duke of Lancaſter had both Abbots, Priors, Monkes and friers, that tooke his parte, as well Biſhops as ſecular Prieſtes, and ſo was it emulation of Religious and ſecular Prieſtes againſt Religious and ſecular Priſtes, which prooveth not your intention. You, your ſelues alſo doe in that place, reſtraine the worde Religious, to ſuch religious men, as had poſſeſſions: excluding the 4. orders of friers, which yet are conteyned vnder the generalitie of the worde Religious in the title of your chapter.

Fol. 15. b. You ſeeme elsvvhere to contradicte your ſelues herein, ſaying: That ſome of the Clergie banded them ſelues againſt the reſt with Iohn of Gant to ſett vpp Wicliff. theare you ſaie, that the ſtatute of Premunire, was begone to be treated of, about the time that Wicliff aroſe, when emulation was in heat againſt the Clergie. If againſt the Clergie, then this emulation, was of the laytie againſt the whole Clergie, ſecular and regular. How can it ſtand, that in Wicliffes

time emulation was whott againſt the whole clergie, and that ſome of the clergie emulated the reſt of the clergie? theſe two cannot well ſtand together.

In the next example yon bring in 3. kings, like Mummers, for they ſay nothing: neither doe you there prove any thinge but in the margent, you note *a malitious ſuggeſtion.* of whom, I pray you? you name no man, and yet would you haue your reader to vnderſtand it, of the ſecular Prieſtes, againſt religious: and that the ſecular Prieſtes did ſuggeſt theſe kinges to take away the Abbay landes. for if you meane not ſo? then the example is to no purpoſe to prove the hurte that hath come by emulation, of ſecular Prieſtes, againſt Religious. If you meane ſo? then turne your note in the Margent vpon your owne malitious hedds, in ſo malitiously ſlandering men of your owne coate, without deſart of their part, and without proof of yours. For who knoweth not, that if the ſecular clergie would hane yelded, or agreed to ſuppreſſe Abbeies, then eſpecially, when heat of emulation was great, againſt the whole clergie, (as you ſay:) but that all had bene loſt, both howſes and lands. No, no, the ſecular clergie was ſo farre from ioyning which the envions laytie in that yſſue, that their conſtant withſtandinge and charitable cleaving to the Religious at that ti-

me, conſerved both their landes and poſſeſ-ſions.

From thoſe 3. kings, your make a great ſtepp downe to Henry the 8. god be bleſ-ſed, that our ſecular Prieſtes, for 200. yeres al-moſt, bare no emulation againſt the Reli-gious. but lived in love and charitie toge-ther, till this kings latter daies, when all the Religious vveare turned out of their howſes, and their lands taken from them. But hap-pened this (I pray you) thronghe the emu-lation, that was betwene the ſecular Prieſtes and the Religious? Put your hands to your conſciences, were the ſecular clergie the doers and ſticklers herein? If you ſay, they gaue their conſent in the Parlament, I grant. But not for any emulation, they had againſt the Religious. Was it not for frailtie and fea-re? or was it not (as you ſay well elſwheare of the bringinge in of the ſtatute of Premunire) for that our Catho. Bishopps and Prelatz did not willinghy conſent, but ſore againſt their wills, was it paſſed in the Parlement, by the ſtreame of temporall power and emulation againſt them. Why may not our Prelats of king Heury the eights time, be aſwell excu-ſed for conſentiug, to the ſupperſſing of Re-ligious howſes, as the Prelats of an other king, for conſentinge to the ſtatute of Pre-munire? who is ſo blinde as to thinck, that the vnited Prieſtes, are the Authors of this

Fol. 15.

booke? or thay ther vvould be ſo shameleſſe, as to accuſe men of their ovvne coate, the vvhole clergie of Inglād, in kindge Henry the eighths time, by emulatiō and mallice vvhich they bore to the Religious, tō haue conſented to their deſtruction, and to the euerſion of their hovvſes and Cloiſters? Suerly, if this vvere true, you ſaid ſome vvhat. For this emulation in deed brought, vnſpeakable hurt and domage, to our poore contrey of Ingland. I gheſſe therefore (as I ſaid before,) that ſome other hath borrovved your names, to make emulation amongſt you ſecular Priſtes your ſelues. If I gheſſe amiſſe? I aske perdon. ſeeing it is lawfull for euerye man (as you knovv,) to defend his order, vocation, name and eſtimation, ſo it be not done vvhich contempt, diſgracing or dishonoringe, of any others order or vocation.

The 4. example vvhich you bring, to proue the fore ſaid emulation, is of Q. Maries time vvhich ſeameth very ſtrange to me. For both at her commìng to the Crovvne, and duringe the time of her raigne, there vvere but fevv Religious men (God knovveth) ſpecially of ſuch as had poſſeſsions, to be emulated or envied: a fevv Benedictines in Weſtminſter Abbay, and a fevv Carthuſicas onely excepted. Hovv lykly is it then, (I pray you) that the emulation

of the ſecular Prieſtes againſt the Religious in Q. Maries time, bronght great hurt to Ingland? But you ſeeme ſo deeply plonged in this emulation your ſelues, that you date againſt the knovvne truth ſay: that the fore ſaid emulation hindred much in her time the reconſiliation, *vvherby no perfect reformation could be made, nor ſuch reſtitution of Religious orders, as in iuſtice ſhould haue beene, and as the good Q. Her ſelf deſired.* And here you cannot cover your ſelues vnder the cloake of the Layetie, ſaying you meane heere of the emulatiō of the Layetie againſt the vvhole clergie: bicauſe you ſay: by the ſame emulation, that vvas in Iohu of Gants time, for you repete in all your examples, that doe follovv that of Iohu of Gant, *by the ſame emulation*, that is: of ſecular Prieſtes againſt Religious. But each one of my age, or elder, that ſavv the begining and ende, of that vertuous Princeſſe her Raigne, can controvvle you in this pointe, and tell you: there vvas nō ſuch emulation at all. euerye man deſiring, the perfect reformatiō of Religion, and entire reſtitution, of religious orders and hovvſes: and the cauſe, vvhy neither the one, nor thother vvas performed, vvas not (as it pleaſeth you to ſay,) the emulation of ſecular Priſtes againſt religious, but rather the shortnes of her Raigne, vvith the difficultie to get the Abbay lands, out of the poſſeſſion, of the Nobilitie,

and

and Gentlemen, vvho kept them, as hitherto moſt vniuſtly they doe.

You are vvellcome at laſt, to her Majeſties Raigne, vvithout any good or lavvfull proof, of your former propoſition: (vvhich the Reader muſt haue in mynde) *that the emulation (forſooth) of ſecular Prieſtes againſt Religious hath brought great hurt to Ingland.* Novv you are come to the laſt caſt, I hope you vvill ſay ſome thinge. Truly as much as you did before, vvhich is iuſt nothinge. You ſay: *There vvas ſmall vnion of diuers clergie men amongeſt them ſelues.* What is this to the purpoſe? The emulation or ſmall vnion and affection vvas betvveene ſecular Prieſtes, and not againſt the Religious. And ſo you are vvell come home, having made a longe Iurney of 200. yeres, and brought vs home nothinge: you haue fayrely fiſhed, to catth a frogg. If all vvere true you ſay, in the diſgrace of our conſtant clergie, (vvhich you ſhall neuer be able to proue,) and if diuers clergie men, holding vvith Hereticks and polliticks, gave occaſion of the totall ouerthrovv of Religion in Inglād, yet doth it not proue, your pretended purpoſe. For that vvas the emulation of ſecular Prieſtes, againſt ſecular Priſtes, except you take the vvorde *clergie men* in generall, as it doth comprehend vnder it, both ſecular Prieſtes, and Religious men: then as vvell Religious, *Can dno. 12. q. 1.*

as ſecular Prieſtes, did hold vvith Heretikes and politiks, to the totall ouerthrovv of Religion. And ſo in this caſe it vvas emulation betvvene the ſecular Prieſtes and Religious, againſt ſecular Prieſts and Religious, and ſo vvithout the compaſſe of your propoſition. Suppoſe I ſay, (for we muſt be Pythagorians, to beleeue vvhat ſoeuer you ſay vpon your vvords, (*quia ipſe dixit*) that ſome clergy man, follovves the time, ād holds vvith the Heretiks, in heat of faction: vvill you therefore, in heat of detraction conclude there vpon, that in the beginning of her Maieſtates Raigne, the emulation of ſecular Prieſts againſt Religious, hath brought great hurt to Ingland? You might haue ſpared this paine, vvith Inck and papier.

Fol. 2. a. The 3. fault. That the true opinion, of not going to Hereticall ſeruice, was taught then, by Prieſtes and Religious men, from beyond the Seas. I perceiue that this Religious, the Author of this booke, vvould vvillingly hane his parte, vvith ſecular Prieſtes, vvhen they doe any thing praiſe vvorthie. But I tell you (my vnited brethren,) you might hane putt vp the vvorde *Religious*, in your purſe. For the beſt opinion, vvas knovvne, taught and folovved, many a yere, before the Ieſuits (vvhom you meane) came or vvrote into Ingland. It came from beyonde the ſeas I confeſſe, but yet out of a ſecular Prieſtes ſhoppe,

Doctor Sanders having vvritten a booke in Englishe of Images, made a long preface to it, vvherin he admonished, ād exhorted all such as vvere Catholiks in hart and mynd, to shunne and avoide, all Communication vvith Hereticks, in their seruice. The vvhich booke made many to abstaine, from their conuenticles, and amongst the rest, (I give God hartie thanks therefore) I my self vvas one, and therfore can best tell, vvhich vvay and from vvhom it came, that I forsoke the hereticall church, vvhich is novv 37. or 38. yeres past: at vvhat time, the name of the Societie, vvas scarsly hard of in Oxford, I am assured. I speak not this to detract any thing, frō the vertuous, painfull and profitable labors and travells, vvhich the fathers of the Societie haue taken, in manuring the afflicted viniard of or Conutrey, but to give every man his due praise:

The second praise, of plāting and teaching this better opinion, belongeth as vvel to many ancicient Priestes, of Q. Maries daies, that stood firme and stable in their faith, and drevve daily some out of the mire of schisme, by their preaching and teaching, vvhereof I my self am a vvittnes, having knovvne many that vvere reconciled by them, many a yere, before any Religious, either from beyond the seas, or at home, taught this doctrine. And as for our Seminarie Priestes also vvhō entred

ſome yeres before the fathers, there vvere (vvhé they cam in) aboue an hundred, vvhich had travailed in this pointe to vvith dravve men from comunicating vvith Heretickes, And God ſo bleſſed their travaills, that the fathers found the harveſt vvel aduaunced, before their arrivall, to their great ioy and conſolation, as I can beſt teſtifie, vvho vvent into Ingland vvith them. Beſids diuers of our Seminarie Prieſtes, had ſuffred glorious Martyrdome, for teaching and preaching this doctrine, before any Religious vvritt thereof, or came into Ingland, as M. *Cutbert Maine* batcheler of diuinitie, and the firſt Martyr of the Seminaries, *M. John Nelſon* and *M. Everand Hanſe*. What meand you then (you vnited Prieſtes,) to take avvay the praiſe from your ſelues, and to give or divide that vvhich is due to your coate only, to others, or vvith others that haue no part therin? There vvas, as I ſaid before, (as by the Regiſtre thereof vvhé nead ſhall require, I can shevve) above a hundred Seminarie Prieſtes in Ingland, that taught this perfect doctrine, ſome yeres before any religious man, putt his foot into Ingland. If you knevv not thus much before, learne it novv. But let vs putt the caſe, that the foreſaid true doctrine, of not going to Hereticall ſeruice vvas taught by Religious men from beyond the ſeas, vvill you therfore conclude that the emulation of Secular

Prieſtes againſt Religious, hath brought great hurt to Ingland? This you muſt prove, or deceive your Reader. For the title of the chapter importeth ſo much. In your next edition, or in your larger Appologie, vvhich you promis, putt out hardly, or els correct, this bragge of Religious men teaching, from beyond the ſeas, the perfecte doctrine, of not going to Hereticall churches, bicauſe they came too late, to haue that glorye, vvhich is only due to Secular Prieſtes: albeit you vnited Prieſtes, do ſeeme both vvrongfully and vniuſtly, to give it to others. ſuch honor beare you to Religious, that you vvill for their ſakes, dishonor both your ſelues and your brethren.

At laſt vve are come, from Iohn of Gant, to vviſbich caſtle, vvhere you ſay, vvas emulation of ſecular Prieſtes againſt Ieſuites: ergo your haue proved that vvhich you tooke in hand to prove. Nothing leſſe. bicauſe that emulation (as you confeſſe) vvas but of ſome fevve againſt one Ieſuit and 19. other ſecular Prieſtes, and ſo proveth it not that vvhich you pretend. You ſay, thoſe fevve Prieſtes vvere the cauſe of that contention. They ſay: fa: Edmonds and his adherents vvere the cauſe. ſo that *Lis eſt adhuc coram Iudice*, to be decided and reſolved not by theſe Appologies, but by our Superiors authoritie. I pray God it may be ſo done vvith charitie.

But for better proof of this emulation you alleadge the firſt contention, of the Engliſhe Romaine Colledge, then G. G. and G. vvrittinge againſt D. Allen and fa. Parſons, vvhich appertaine nothing at all, to this contention betvvene the diſcontented bretherne, and the Archprieſt and Ieſuits. This contention being grovvnded vpon tvvo other matters. thone for not receaving the Archprieſt, vpon the Card. Protectors letters, for the vvhich fa: Liſter proved them Schiſmaticks. thother, for that after the comming of his Holl. breue, and their ſubmiſſion, the Archprieſt then, vvould not admitt them to be abſolved, of any Confeſſor, except they confeſſed their ſchiſme, and abiured it. This is the ſtate of the controuerſie, in queſtion betvvene you, and your diſcontented bretherne. This is the cauſe of their vvritting, both in Latin and English, in their ovvne defence. But this you vvinck at, and vvill not ſee, yet this you muſt prove, not to be the ſtate of the queſtion, and cauſe of this contention, or els you muſt aske them forgiueneſſe, for ſo ſlaunderous, and ſcandalous iniuries done to them. Theeſe queſtions you touche not: but vvith toies and trifles, fill vp your booke and caſt duſt (as it vvere) in your readers eies, to blinde, or at the leaſt vviſe to hinder them, from vievving the queſtion, and controuerſie it ſelf.

For example vvhat doe the troubles in Rome in the yere 1578. or the death of *Vanne* the ſpie 1581. or the deuiſion that fill amongſt Englishmen in Paris 1580. or all thet memorialls made againſt the Seminarie, (if any ſuch vvere) 1583. and 84. or B. Sega his viſitation 1585. or G. G. and E. G. Writting againſts D. Allen and fa? Parſons 1587. or all the factions that vvere made againſt D. Allen: or M. Watſons common vvealth, appartaine to this cõtrouerſie? What doth all this ſtuff (I ſay) appartaine to the ſturres begone in Wisbiche 1595. and the contentions vvhich ſince hath folovved? vvere your diſcontented bretherne, either Actors, Abettors, Doers or ſticklers in all theeſe Tragedies? Had they their hands or pennes therin? Nothing leſſe. You might as vvel accuſe them, of all the contentions and quarrelles that hath happened betvvene the Englishs, ſince Noes floud, as vvith theſe. Many of them to my knovvledg, being but yong youthes in thoſe daies. To vvhat purpoſe then is this vnprofitable and vnſaverie reherſall, ripping vp and reviving, of the faults and follies of many yet living, vvho peraduenture are ſorie for the ſame? Is this charitie? commeth this from a peaceable, or a contentious ſpirit? to revive old ſoares quite forgotten, and buried many yeares ſince in deep obliuion? and that to no purpoſe at all? Doth it prove the great hurt, vvhich the e-

mulation of ſecular Prieſtes, againſt the Religious, hath brought to Ingland? as iuſt in ſooth as Germaines lipps, that ſtood 9. miles a ſonder: even ſo theſe actions ſtand at leaſt 10. or 11. yeares one from an other.

The ripping vp of the Actions of thoſe 2. Prieſtes of the Romaine Colledge G. G. and E. G. the willing diſcoverie of their filthines after 20. yeres almoſt, makes me beleeve, that the Author of this booke, is not you (vnited Prieſts,) who for shame would not, nor without your owne dishonor could not, ripp vp the rottē naughtines of men of your owne coate, thone (as I haue bene aduertiſed, by a good father his Confeſſor) dying very ſory and penitent, for his ſinnes & offencs: thother yet living, and of abilitie and learning, to ſett vpon you, and to refute you, of many things, vnduly ſett downe in this your Apologie. And yet all that you haue ſaid of theirs and other mens frailties, maketh nothing to the matter now in queſtion, as I haue noted before. I pray God, ſome Religious Parſon then offended, hath not kept this vpon his ſtomack, till time hath ſerved him, to vomitt it out, to the diſgracing of ſecular Prieſtes. If it be ſo, God forgiue him, and ſend him grace, not by ſuch vndecent meanes, either to diuert others, from eſteaming of ſecular Prieſtes, or to make ſecular Prieſtes,

to leſſe eſteame him and his compaignons, as he geveth them iuſt occaſion: ſeeing he ſeeketh euery cornere and hole, *& omnem mouet lapidem*, to diſgrace them, vvith the faults and follies of ſome one or two, deſerving reprehenſion.

And bicauſe you make mention, of ſome former troubles happened in the college of Rome, I will for the readers better inſtructiō ſett downe in order, the fiue ſeuerall troubles, that haue falne out in that vnfortunat Colleage, with in the ſpace of 20. yeres. ſince the fondation thereof which was in the yere 1578.

This colleag had bin an hoſpitall, to receaue English pilgrimes at their comyng to Rome, and there were ſome 8. prieſts in it, vnder a hedd: the which hoſpitall, by the procurement and induſtrie of D. Lewes, afterwards B. of Caſſano, (as they confeſſe) was erected by Pope Gregorie the 13. into a College: the 8. prieſtes by violence (allmoſt) put out, bicauſe they would not obey to the Popes commandement. Schollers were ſent from Rhemes to ſupplie their places, ād one of the ſaid prieſtes M. Do: Morrice Clenock a Welchman, being Do. Lewes frend, was made Rector there. Into this college were receaued aſwell welch as Inglish, as to this daye they are indifferently receaued. There were not then many welch men, but ſome 32.

Inglish ſchollers. Their firſt complaint was, that the welchmen were better clothed, and better looked vnto, thē they were, and that the Rector was parciall, in ſo much that there grewe great ſtrief, and dangerous quarrels In the end the Protector (who was thē Card. Morono, a great frend and vpholder of D, Morrice: and it may be M. Do. Lewes for frendship and contrey ſake, might alſo backe him) expelled the 32. English ſchollers vpon a Shrouetewſday: whiles this ſturre was amongſt them, th'English for the cauſes you mention, and with great zeale deſired to be gouerned by the Fathers of the Societie. Being thus expelled the next day being Ashwenſday, they diſperſed them ſelues in diuerſe Churches, requeſting the preachers to recommend their caſe and pouertie, to gett them ſome money, for they had determyned to returne altogether in Proceſſion (as it were) and with a croſſe before them to Rhemes or Ingland. In the meane while his Holl. was informed of all by Father Parſons, and Fa. Alfonſo, who gathering ſuch of the ſchollers together as he could meet withall, and bringing them to the Pope, there was old weeping and crying on both ſides. The good old ffa. Weept, as one loath to looſe ſo many zelous and towardly children, and they on thother ſide cried for ſorrovvē, that they ſhould be conſtraind againſt their vvilles to

leaue and forsake so louing a father. But after they had vviped their eies, the Pope sent thē vvith one of his chamber in their compaine, to commād the Rector to receaue them againe: and at their returne, they tooke 2. others into the college vvith them, vvho aftervvard proued naughtie fellovvs called Novvell and Moonday. Not long after, they had their desier: for the gouernement of the college vvas giuen to the Fathers, to the schollers great contentement and good of our countrey, ād so ended this first sturre and dissention.

The second, happened the next yere 1579. vvhich vvas rather a certaine murmure then dissention: the vvhich if by fa. Parsons vvisdom and industrie it had not bin preuented, vvould in time haue grovvne to an open sedition. The cause vvas this. Our schollers hauing obtained their desire and falling to their studies vsed very zealously all the godly exercises of mortification, in such sort, as some one or tvvoe of them became so contemplatiue that they vvould needs be Iesuits. Which vvhen their companions vnderstood, they begane to mislike of those spirits, alleaging that the college vvas founded for the education of vertuous and learned prieſtes to help their contrey, and not to bring vp men to enter into Religion, and leaue the harueſt at home. Where vppon fa. Parsons procured D. Allens comming vp to Rome, vvho obtained

of the Pope, to command the Generall of the Ieſuits to ſend of his Religious into Ingland. the vvhich appeaſed all this murmur. For (quoth the Schollers) let as many novv enter into the ſocietie as vvill, for vvhen they haue beene ſufficiently brought vp therin, they shalbe ſent into Ingland. And thus each partie vvas pleaſed. The fathers, for that they might receiue of the ſchollers into their ſocietie, vvithout grudg or miſlike: and the ſchollers, by cauſe ſuch as entred, moſt of all (if not all) should be in time emploied for their countrey. And ſo the 2. ſchollers that firſt entred into the Societie of that college vvere M. Wright a conſtant Confeſſor novv in Ingland and Iohn Barton, vvho after fell from them and looked back to the vvorld againe, as I am credibly enformed.

The 3. vvas that, vvherein M. Doctor Bagshavve and M. D. Stafferton (dead long ſince) M. Warford (novv a Ieſuit) and diuers others had their parte. I haue heard, they vvould haue had the gouernemẽt of the College giuen to the Dominican friers, or to haue it gouerned by English ſecular prieſtes. In th'end it fell out that good fa. Alfonſo vvas diſplaced and an other put in his place.

Not many yeres after fell out another cõtrouerſie betvveene the ſchollers and father Creſvvell then Rector, D. Allen being then Card. ād a ſpectator. I knovv not vvell vvhat

the cauſe vvas. but this I am ſuer that a vertuous prieſt novv a holy Martyr in heauen named M. Iohn Ingram, vvas not ouer vvell vſed. This ſturre in the ende procured father Creſvvells removing from thence to Spaine.

The laſt ſturre vvhich vvas the vvhotteſt endured longeſt and vexed moſt the fathers. It began (as you ſay) after Card. Allens death about the yere 1594. vpon this occation, as you aftervvard inſinuat, and the Actors cõfeſſe: father Harvvood the miniſter finding 2. youthes clapping them ſelues on the breeches, or rather one for ſome reveng ierking his fellovve on the buttock vvith a rodd, before he vvas out of his bed, had ſome ſuſpiciõ of vvorſer behavior and should (as I haue heard) ſay, he founde thẽ at Buggerie, vvhich vvhen the reſt vnderſtood, it did gtieue them full ſore, that the fathers (and ſpecially Inglishe fathers) should ſuſpect any of our nation vvith that abhominable ſinne, ãd calling to mynde ſome of the fathers former actions tending to this ſuſpition, as cutting the priuie dores beneath shorter by half a foote, to ſee if there vvere any more then tvvoe feet at once at one priuie, and cutting dovvne a faier groue in the vineyard, bicauſe they vſed on their daies of recreation, to vvalk there by tvvo and tvvo. They fell firſt into ſuch a hatred of the ſaid fa. Harvvood, that they made a ſupplication to his Holl: deſiring him to

ſend the ſaid fa. to the Gallies, for dishonoringe and diſcrediting the Colledg, them ſelues, and their nation, vvith ſuch a calumnious report. Vpon this they fell euery day more, and more, into miſlike vvith the fathers, and into this laſt ſedition. Whither the ſchollers had cauſe to be offended, and to cõplaine, I leaue it to the iudgment of others. Thus much touching theſe troubles, vvherin if I haue miſreported any thing, I deſier to be better enformed, for I tell it, as I haue heard it of others, according as you tell your tales alſo by heareſay. My meaning herein not being to defend the ſchollers, or diſcredit their Superiors, but to tell the truth only,

If any do muſe at theſe frequent ſeditions, and vvould knovv the cauſes thereof, albeit my opinion is, but one doctors opinion: yet ſuch as it is, I vvill communicat it to you, hauing duly marked the cauſes my ſelf, and hauing heard other mens iudgmente alſo therein. That vvhich I vvill ſay novv, I ſent once to father Creſvvell then Rector vpon an occaſiõ vvhich vvere to longe here to ſet dovvne, and nothinge to the purpoſe. After I had called to his mynde the contentions, vvhich had often before that time happened in the Colledge, and recounted the nomber of Spies, and revolters, from the faithe vvhich had been menbers of the ſame college, and that till that time, there had neuer happened

any one ſedition in the Seminaries of Douay or Rhemes, nor any knovven or notorious ſpie, gone ont of them, one Banes (a reuolted prieſt, vvhich yet vvas apprehended and impriſoned) only excepted: I told him that I thought the cauſes of thoſe ſeditions in Rome, vveare one of theiſe that followve. Either the ayre did infect them, or els our contrey men vvere of a levvde and ſeditions nature, or other vviſe that the gouerment of that college, vvas not convenient for our English natures. If the firſt should be the cauſe, then there vvas no other remedie, but to tranſport the college into a better ayer. For the ſecond, I could not ſo hardly iudg of my contrey men, eſpecially hauing ſeene them allvvaies in Rhemes, to be both vertuous ād obedient youthes; and to the third, I neither vvould nor durſt attribute it to the fathers. F. Generall and Prouinciall, the Rectors, ſuperiors being ſo neare, and hauing ſo vigilāt an eye on the gouerment. What shall vve thē doe novv qnoth I? Mary, father, chaunge the gouerment for a time, to ſee if they vvill doe better, and liue more quietely. And if they doe not, then the vvorld muſt needs attribute it, to our evvill and ſeditious natures. Vntill then vve muſt ſuſpend our iudgmēt. this vvas the effect of my letter. for the vvhich he courteouſly thancked me, and ſaid he vvould communicat my reaſons vvith his ſu-

periors.

But seeing I am on this point, I will boldly sett downe what I haue all waies thought in that gouerment, to be not conuenient to our English nature, but is rather the cause both of rancor and diuision amongst the schollers, and of the dislike and discontentment of the gouerment and Gouerners.

I was pensioner in D. Allens companie in in that Colleage 4. monethes and more, and then I marked and vnderstood the mislike of this gouerment, by those that had bene most desirous of the fathers gouerment, I meane M. Sherwin, M. Array, M. Haddock M. Rishton, and others my familiares then in the colleage. The first is, their open penances done in the hall, and their *dicitur culpa*. which is as farre from all good orderly discipline, that when a man doth it at the first, he is so farre ordinarily from amendment, that in his hart he doth grutch, and repine at his superiors, for the geuing of it. But when he is vsed 3. or 4. times to doe it, then he maketh a very scoff and mocking or may game of it: so farre it is from a true penãce, at is engendreth (as I said) both hatred and mockery. If you say it is not the superiors fault. I say it is, if he knoweth it will bring forth no other effects and yet will vse it.

The second is their Spies, which the Rectors haue allwaies in store, which by an honester

neſter name are called Angeli cuſtodes.

Theiſe ſpies at recreation time, and in other places, ſpeake liberally againſt their ſuperiors, of their gouerment and vſage towards them, of their apparell, meate and drinck, and againſt the ſtraight keapiug of them in, and againſt what ſoeuer they thinke is not wel done in the colleadge. And all this to ſounde their compaignons. Now if one or twoe hap to diſcourſe, as he doth againſt the Superior: theeſe ſpies carry the wholy diſcourſe ſtraight to the Rector. After a fewe daies the other are called *Coram nobis*, ād are either punished or rigorouſly reprehended for the ſame. Theeſe good felowes afterward recall to mynde, before whom, and in whoſe preſence and what companie, they ſpake ſuch thinges, and hauing diſcouered this good felowe, they from that day forewards, hate him as a ſpie and traitor. If this be a charitable way of gouerment iudge you, and whither this be true, and practized continually or no, I referre it to the conſcience of as many of you (vnited brethrene) as haue bene brought vp in that Seminarie, and to the knowledg of all others, that haue bene brought op therin, yea to thoſe them ſelues that haue bene theſe good Angells. Nothing ſo contrary to an englishmans nature, as to be betrayed by him whom he truſteth. If ſuch ſpies were in Oxford (whoſe colleges haue as good

ſtatute and ordonances for bringing vp of youthes, if they were put in practise (no diſpleaſure to the Fathers) as they haue or can deuiſe) if ſuch ſpies I ſay weare in our colleages of Oxford, they would be plucked in peeces.

The 3. cauſe of diſcontentment, mother of ſedition, is when ſuch ſchollers as haue whollie addicted them ſelues to prieſthood to ſerue their countrey, ſee others which entend to be of the ſocietie, to be more fauored, more cherished and more often in Fa. Miniſters chamber at collations, haue more free acceſſe to the Rector, and to be better countenanced then they: this affectiō which the Fathers beare to ſuch, can neither be wiſely hidd of th'one, nor well digeſted of th'other.

The 4. and which aggrauated the contention in Fathers Creſwels time, and was the occaſion of theiſe laſt and greteſt troubles, as you ſeeme to confeſſe afterwards, is: that the Rectors and Miniſters are ouer much ſuſpicious of, our English youthes thinking them to be giuen to that ſinne, which is not to be named. thereof came the cutting downe of a faire groue which was in their vineyard wherein they vſed ſomtimes to walk for their recreation, two and twoe or more together. Which doings did wonderfully animate the ſchollers a-

gainſt their ſuperiors, as I vnderſtood by a vertuous prieſt, vvho ſince by Martyrdome is no doubt a bleſſed Sainct in Heauen.

The cauſe, grounde and beginning alſo of theiſe laſt troubles came they not of that vvhich Father Harvvood ſaid (albeit after, he ſvvore the contrary:) that the found tvvo, of thoſe libertine ladds committing that abhominable ſinne? the man you note in the margent and your fellovve prieſtes now in Ingland ſay ſo, and you your ſelues vnderſtand ſo much by your *Somme thinges much amiſſe.* If it be true that Father Harvvood affirmed ſo much as in the 43. leafe you inſinuate: their diſſolucion in corners to hane bene ſo ſecret a ſinne, that he could neuer be brought to vtter it for the ſauing their honors and the nations, till (forsooth) he was commanded by obedience a litle before his deathe. that he might dy, belike, vvith that glory, to haue infamed the ſtudents. Had not thoſe Northen and ſouthren ladds good cauſe, thinck you to defend their honors and the honor of their countrey? Had they not iuſt cauſe to require the Pope (as they did by ſupplication) to ſend Fa. Harvv. to the Gallies, for defamyng both the colleage and nation? Whither it vveare true or falſe god knovveth, neither vvill nor can I decide it: yet vvas this Father much more to be commended, then a nother Father, vvho in re-

uenge of the factious ſchollers, vvithout reſpect of their honor or of the honor of our nation, or of his ovvne conſcience, letted not to ſend about the vvorld generall articles againſt all the ſchollers and prieſtes of that faction, the vvhich contained more greuous and abhominablé ſinnes then Father Harvvood diſcouered. Of this occaſion then begane all that fovvle ſturre vvhich as the diſconted bretherne ſay, had like to haue vndoone and ruynated that Colledge.

The 5. is, that the Rectors (yea our English Rectors) in the Romaine Colledge haue no reſpect of ſuch Graduates as are made in our Vniuerſities in Ingland, but vvill make more of a boy, and giue him better countenance, and place him higher at the table, then to a Baccheler or a M. of arte, vvhich cannot be but a great coriſiue to ſuch graduats a great fault ád in gouermét eſpecially of English Fa. vvho either doe or should knovve, vvhat eſteeme learning ád degrees také in ſcholes (albe it many in deed are vnvvorthie of them) are in Ingland: and hovv an vnlearned man hauing a degree, is of greater reſpect and credite then a more learned then he hauing no degree. This is the good cuſtome of our conntrey that carrieth ſuch reſpect and honor to the degree, albeit the Graduat be not vvorthie

therof, bicauſe all men preſume he hath the learning requiſite to the degree. But the Fathers, whither it be vnder the couler of making them humble, or for ſomme other cauſe beſt knowen to them ſelues, doe giue very litle, or no credit or countenance at all to Graduates. And a nother thinge) which hath bene noted of ſomme men) they neuer ſent any from that college into Ingland with any degree of ſcholes on their backs 2. only excepted, who being ſpecially fauored and loued of Father Alfonſo were made Doctors in Rome before their miſſion, yet neither of them went into Ingland, but were both ſtaied at Rhemes. *D. Barrett. D. Stillinghton.*

You goe abont afterwards to defend the Fathers from this calumniation (as you tearme it) how I pray you? Mary they haue receued many Graduates into the Societie. What is this to the complaint of not reſpecting Graduats in the Seminarie? yes (ſay you) for many Graduates haue liued in the Seminarie with them much eſteamed and honored by the Ieſuits. You name 4. and yet 3. of them vpon my knowledg, were fauored as the firſt Authors and bringers in of the Fathers to that gouerment, and honored not for their degrees, but as Prieſtes, and as Prieſtes they ſate at a higher *Fol. 92. 93.*

and more honorable table then the reſt. But if rheiſe 4. haue beene reſpected, how many others haue bene neglected? You confeſſe in the ſame place, that they are greatly made of by the Fathers, if their vertue anſwere to their degree. Who ſeeth not, that you confeſſe, they are not reſpected for their degree, but for their vertue only? Put caſe he be not ſo vertuous as his ſuperior would haue him, shall he therby looſe the reſpect that is due to his degree? There are punishmẽtes for his faulte, his degree ſtill reſpected. But with the Fathers who you ſay, are men of order, in this caſe of degrees, is keapt litle order.

To the man you note in the mergent (who complayned of the diſgrace of degrees) whẽ he was ſent from Rhemes to Rome, I ſaid thus to him. Maſter Bagshawe your are going to Rome and in your companie ſuch and ſuch (namyng 2. poore ſchollers that ſerued him and the reſt at the table) when you come theare, you shall ſee theis boies (your ſeruants here) aſwell clothed, lodged and ſerved there as your ſelf, paraduenture more in fauor, and better liked of the ſuperior then you, and to ſitt higher at the table them you, can you abide this? thinck on it, for ſo it will happen, as it did in deed. Which made him, Maeſter Stafferton, Warford (now a Ieſuite) Fixer, D. Cicill and o-

thers hauing bene all Graduats of ād good accompt in Oxford to diſlike and ſtorme at it, as many others haue doone ſince, and ſtill wil doe, till Graduate, be better reſpected. If one poore Doct. iudgment might be heard and allowed, I thinck veryly, if thoſe fore ſaid impedimētes weare taken awaie, the Fathers and our yonthes would liue louingly, & in peace together. But if this be not remedied then I ſay (though I be no Prophet, yet beare I a Prophets name) that theſe diſcontentments may well for a time lye ſmothering in their breaſts: but one day, doe the Fathers what they can, they will flush out into flames of diſſentiō as th'others haue done before. It is naturall to that college the foreſaid impedimente not remoued, but remayninge in their force.

And to augment mens ſuſpicions, and ſurmiſes of the ſmall accompt the Fathers make of degrees and Graduats, they haue obtayned a ſtrang and exttaordinary Bull to the diſcredirt and dishonor of our whole nation, to ſtopp all English ſtudents in their banishmēt from the degree of Doctorshipp either in diuinitie or lawe, I wonder they putt not in Phiſicke alſo, (Doctor Norden, a Doctor of Phiſick beiug ſo great an enemy to them as you the vnited bretherne do shewe in this your Apologie) and by conſequence to ſtopp them from all perferment and pro-

motions in ſtraung countreis in this time of their banishments. I may well call it ſtrang, bicauſe all ſtrangers do wonder ſtrangly at it. And I may well terme it extraordinarie, for that ſince Sainct Peter ſate in the Sea of Rome, and that Vniuerſities haue bine erected, theare was neuer ſuch a Bull ſent out into the worlde. The Sea of Rome hath ever bene ſo fauorable to learning & degrees, that it hath inſtituted and confirmed many Vniuerſities, hath geuen auctoritie to certaine, to giue degrees and make Doctors. Yea Canons that are bownd to reſidence, *Quia datur beneficium propter officium*, And to ſerue in the Church Yet in fauor of learning may be ſent to the Vniuerſities to ſtudie, and theare to receaue their fruits till they haue taken their degree. But alas? our poore Englishmen are not ſufficientlye afflicted with banishment from our countreye and parents, but more affliction muſt be putt vpon their shoulders, and as it weare ſegregated from all other nations, and bounde to be men vnworthie and vncapable of Doctorshipp and that by the higheſt iudge, and Tribunal on earth. And why? for ſooth bicauſe our yong Doctors muſt not ſitt above (I will not ſay Ieſuits, but) other grauer and elder Prieſts. For this cauſe the Pope hath annulled and abbreged the Priuilegs

of all Vniuerſities in reſpect of vs poore Soules. This is a point of Mortification in deed, but lett vs here the Bull, which in effect ſaith thus. Our will and pleaſure is, that « none of th'english nation hear after ſo long « as Hereticks prevaile in Ingland, &c. doe « take degree of Doctor in Diuinitie or in one « of the lawes, vnleſſe they haue ſtudied 4. yeres in the ſame ſcience or profeſſion. Thoſe « ended, to ſtudie 4. yeres more to make him « prompt and ſolide, and to become more mature graue and learned : Nor then neither « ſhall he proceade, without the conſent and « approbation of the Superior of the College « or Seminary wherin he hath ſtudied or bene « brought vpp, nor without the approbation « of the Protector of the Nation or his vicegerent in thoſe partes where thoſe English- « men would be promoted, &c. Who ſoeuer « then ſhall take the degree of Doctor in any « place or contrey with in the time and yeres « above preſcribed, or without the leaue of his « Superior, Protector or his vicegereut, we « pronownce the degree to be none, nor ſuch « a one to be called a Doctor. And beſids this « he ſhall encurre the ſentence of excomunic- « ation, the abſolution there from we ſpeci- « ally reſerve to our ſelves and to the Sea A- « poſtolick, &c. And we will this to be in force, « not with ſtanding any Apoſtolick decree « what ſoeuer, or any ſtatute, cuſtome or pre- «

„ viledgs of Vniuerſities given them by the
„ Apoſtolick Bulls,&c.

The reaſon of this Bull is, leaſt youg men be made Doctors and by that meanes the degree come into contempt in Ingland viz: So great care had theſe informers of preſerving the reſpect of degrees in our contrey: for in all other nations in the world, young men may be made Doctors this reaſon not withſtanding. An other reaſon is, leaſt by this doctorshipp, they should goe or ſitt before auncient Prieſtes and learneder, then they are. And this laſt reaſon ſeameth to be the chiefeſt motiue why, this Bull vvas procured, and yet not with ſtanding this Bull, a younge man may march ād ſitt before an elder and grauer Prieſt. For example. If a young man be a Bacheler or Licentiat either in diuinitie or lawe (which is nothing els with vs, but an Inceptor Doctor) would not an elder and grauer Prieſt thinck you, give him place in reſpect of his degree? Noe doubt he would. Then what haue you gotten by your Bull? You muſt gett out an other, if you will ſtopp them from Bachelorshipp or Licentiatship, or els thoſe that tak ſuch degrees will ſitt above you, be you Ieſuit or vnited Prieſte not graduated. Be of good cheare all you that haue not ſtudied in the Seminaries, for this Bull toucheth you not. Next note that it ſaieth in altero Iuris, that is, in one of

the lawes, as if it vvould ſay. No man can proceed Doctor in the Civill lawe alone, or in the Canon lawe alone, without the foreſaid conditions. But vpon my words you may proceed in both lawes without incurring the penalties of the Bull, becauſe it is a penall Conſtitution and therfore to be reſtrained to his caſe, which is in altero Iure in one of the lawes, and not to be extended ad Doctoratum in vtroque Iure to Doctorshipp in both lawes, for the rule is. *Odia reſtringi & fauores conuenit ampliari.*

Beſids, if I should ſay the bull to be of no force bicauſe it may eaſly be proved to be Surreptice, as alſo it vvas not promulgated publickly, and in the place, and with the ſolemnitie, that all like penall Conſtitutions are accuſtomed to be, you would haue much adoe to prove the contrarie.

This Bull was obtained immediatly after the peace made with the ſchollers in the Romaine College viz. the 19. of Sept. 1597. but yet was it not printed till 3. yeres after (when it pleaſed ſuch as had obteined it) viz in the yere 1601. The cauſe as I ſuſpect was for feare leaſt others vvould followe the example of D. Bagshaw D. Stafferton (dead long ſinces) Do: Weſton (vvho hath bene a Reader of Diuinitie many yeres in our Seminaries of Rhemes and Doway) and D. Norris (Whom in contempt you call Italian Do-

ctors) vvho going from the College tooke their degrees by the waye.

See yet the great diuersitie of Iudgment betvvene D. Allene the Father of our Seminaries, and the Procurers of this Bull. When D. Bagshavve and D. Stafferton came to Rhemes and had signified to him they were Doctors, he was so farre from contemninge them, that the next day at dinner he brought them into the hall and placed them him self in their due places, next to th'other Doctors in Diuinitie, th'one above M. Licentiat Parkinson and th'other above me, being but Doctor of Lawe. And this place they keapt so longe as they remained there, to all mens liking and contentment. If such a Bull had either bene necessary profitable or honorable to our contrey, wold not do: Allene (who had as great care of our cuntrey as these Informers haue) haue procured it? Yes I warrant you. But god be blessed that some of vs vveare Doctors before these men cam to governe the court and cuntrey, els might we haue gone begg our bread, and many a one blovv their nailes besids. But vvill you see the absurditie of it? In most vniuersities (as in this also of *Pont a Mousson*) theare are certaine benefices affected to the vniuersitie, and due (when they fall) to the Senior Doctor. Put the case an Englishman hath studied his time and is made Licentiat in Diui-

nitie (as thoſe are here before they be Doctors) with one or twoe more with him whoſe Senior he is. when the time cometh to proceade Doctor his fellowes paſſe, and he is ſtaied by the vertue of this Bull. Some monethes after falleth out a benefice, which one of his fellowes catcheth, and he by reaſon of this bull loſeth it. See what good then it bringeth to our Nation. Againe one that hath ſtudied the lawes ſome yeres is Licentiat, and may when he will take his Doctorshipp. he is in a vniuerſitie where a Doctors place falleth vacant ād he is otherwiſe found capable for it, but by reaſon he prooceded not Doctor (it being a Doctors place) he loſeth it. And ſo by this buggy Bull, all hope of promocion and preferment is taken away hereafter from vs poore Englishmen. *Honos alit artes.* Who will now ſtudie with any courage either in Diuitie to conuince heretiks, either in the Canon lawe to gouerne the church, when they are barred of the reward of their ſtudies and defrauded of the fruites of their labors? But you vvill (perhapps) ſay to me here, as you do often in your Apologie to your diſcontented bretherne, that I find fault with his Holl: actions and doinges. for anſwere wherto, I ſay: I do ſo in deed and vveare I in Rome and worthie to be admitted to his preſence, I would appeale in this point from his Holl: ill informed, to his Hol:

ctors) vvho going from the College tooke their degrees by the waye.

See yet the great diuerſitie of Iudgment betvvene D. Allene the Father of our Seminaries, and the Procurers of this Bull. When D. Bagshavve and D. Stafferton came to Rhemes and had ſignified to him they were Doctors, he was ſo farre from contemninge them, that the next day at dinner he brought them into the hall and placed them him ſelf in their due places, next to th'other Doctors in Diuinitie, th'one above M. Licentiat Parkinſon and th'other above me, being but Doctor of Lawe. And this place they keapt ſo longe as they remained there, to all mens liking and contentment. If ſuch a Bull had either bene neceſſary profitable or honorable to our contrey, wold not do: Allene (who had as great care of our cuntrey as theſe Informers haue) haue procured it? Yes I warrant you. But god be bleſſed that ſome of vs vveare Doctors before theſe men cam to governe the court and cuntrey, els might we haue gone begg our bread, and many a one blovv their nailes beſids. But vvill you ſee the abſurditie of it? In moſt vniuerſities (as in this alſo of *Pont a Mouſſon*) theare are certaine benefices affected to the vniuerſitie, and due (when they fall) to the Senior Doctor. Put the caſe an Englishman hath ſtudied his time and is made Licentiat in Diui-

nitie (as thoſe are here before they be Doctors) with one or twoe more with him whoſe Senior he is. when the time cometh to proceade Doctor his fellowes paſſe, and he is ſtaied by the vertue of this Bull. Some monethes after falleth out a benefice, which one of his fellowes catcheth, and he by reaſon of this bull loſeth it. See what good then it bringeth to our Nation. Againe one that hath ſtudied the lawes ſome yeres is Licentiat, and may when he will take his Doctorshipp. he is in a vniuerſitie where a Doctors place falleth vacant ād he is otherwiſe found capable for it, but by reaſon he prooceded not Doctor (it being a Doctors place) he loſeth it. And ſo by this buggy Bull, all hope of promocion and preferment is taken away hereafter from vs poore Englishmen. *Honos alit artes.* Who will now ſtudie with any courage either in Diuitie to conuince heretiks, either in the Canon lawe to gouerne the church, when they are barred of the reward of their ſtudies and defrauded of the fruites of their labors? But you vvill (perhapps) ſay to me here, as you do often in your Apologie to your diſcontented bretherne, that I find fault with his Holl: actions and doinges. for anſwere wherto, I ſay: I do ſo in deed and vveare I in Rome and worthie to be admitted to his preſence, I would appeale in this point from his Holl: ill informed, to his Hol:

better informed.

The 4. fault I find with you, is, that you say: That the Cardinall Caietan and the Generall of the Iesuits did hinder the promocion of D. Lewes B. of Cassano, but falsly as you haue credibly heard, Nay, that vvhich you heard to the contrary was credibly false. For, vvhich of you haue not heard that the said B. and fa: Parsons stood for the redd cap, and that the report wēt, that one of the two should vveare it? so that euery man as he affected the partie vvished and desired it. yea, the report runneth abrode that many hands and subscriptions vveare gathered in Ingland and Flannders in Fa: Parsons favor for the redd hat. The suspition that the 2. before named labored for him against the B. vvas encreased by this, that the yce beiug now broken to the Cardinallshipp by the creation of Tolledo one of the Societie, and Tolledo beiug dead, that the generall of the Iesuits and the Protector, (who was vvholly the Iesuits) vveare more vvilling to haue a man of their ovvne and wholly addicted to the societie to be preferred, rather then a man, whō for many yeres they accompted of as one not at all addicted to the societie, but ioyned to the faction that vvas against them, as you insinuate before, and in this place also. Besids, as theare vvas no man of our vvholle nation thought so hable for that dignitie as fa: Par-

ſons, ſo no man vvas ſo fitt to be oppoſed to the B: as he, for by all licklyhood vvithout any oppoſition, the B. might haue carried it avvay. An other preſumption of fa perſons preferment vvas, that having (as the reporte runneth) made a booke of the ſucceſſion of Ingland in favor of the Infante of Spaigne, he had gotten therby both favour and credite vvith the good old kinge, vvho could doe much in the obteyning of a Cardinalls hate. And beſids all this at that preſent time, vvhen theſe rumors rane abrode, fa. Parſons came from Spaigne to Rome, in the companie of tvvo Spanish Cardinalls. All theis pteſumptions put together made ſome proofe he aſpired to the redd hate, and that the Protector and Generall vvould ſtand for him againſt the Biſshop. Yet to giue you more certaine ſatisfaction that Fa: perſons and his frends did all they could to hinder the B. (for vvhat cauſe god knovveth) I vvill (to imitate you) ſett dovvne the Bishopps ovvne vvords in his laſt lettere that euer he vvrott to me, dated the 10. of march 1595. after ſome fevve perticuler affaires thus he ſaithe.

We haue loſt our good Card: Allene, he made me executor of his vvil vvith 3. Cardinalls, and vve euer haue bene frends though ſome euill diſpoſed did ſeeke to ſeperat vs for their ovvne gaine, and ill purpoſes. And novv there is ſuch a ſtinck iug ſturre in Flan-

„ ders, Spaigne and Rome, to make Fa Parſons
„ Cardinall and ſo by conſequente to exclude
„ me, that it is allmoſt incredible. But yet it is
„ ſo thoughe it be lick to haue no other effect,
„ but the diſcovering of Ambition, the blot-
„ ting of that bleſſed Religion and diſcorda-
„ mongſt our nation and perſecution againſt
„ me, leaſt I ſtep before and ſtand betvvene
„ them and the fire. The doers of this are but
„ 2. or 3. of our Nation, vvhich tumble all vp
„ and dovvne. All the reſt, beſt and vviſſeſt do
„ loue and honor me. And in this Court it is
„ merveiled at of ſtrangers highe and lovve.
„ They ſay Iam an Italian, that I paſſe not for
„ the Nation, that I am Brittannus and not ve-
„ rus Anglus. That I vvil neucr returne into
„ Ingland, if it vveare Catholick: falſe impu-
„ dent lies and ſclanders, vvhich I pray you cō-
„ fute as occaſion shal ſerve. By lies, they may
„ hinder others, but neuer are like to helpe
„ them ſelues. In deed I am 61. yeres old, and
„ am not therfore like to ſee Ingland, but if
„ the way were open, I vvould leave Bishop-
„ prick and all vvorldly ſtates in this caſe, and
„ go to ſerve my naturall conntrey and coun-
„ trey men, vvhom in banishment I haue euer
„ ſerued and loued more then all theis good
„ fellovves. I ſeeke not to be Cardinall, bicauſe
„ I knovve not, *An ille ſtatus expediat & ſalutī*
„ *animæ meæ conveniat*. But let god do his devine
prouidence, vvho knovveth vvhat is beaſt

for

for vs all. Thus I confidenrly tell you my mynde, bicauſe I knovv you love me and I will ever loue you. Thus much the Bishoppe.

Novv of theeſe premiſſes, coniecture I beſeech you vvhither the ſchollers vvho deſired the preferment of him, vvhom they tooke to be founder as it vveare of that Colleage, and the fitteſt and vvorthieſt of all ſecular Prieſts of our nation to haue that honor after Card: Allens death, had not iuſt cauſe to ſuſpect the forenamed to be his aduerſaries, and hindrers from attayning that highe dignitie? For my parte, as I vvas no dealer either for the one nor th'other, ſo I vviſhed one of the tvvoe to be advaunced, I cared not vvhich. For knovving that thoſe tvvoe that ſtoode for it, to be fitteſt and capableſt men of our vvhole nation, both at home or abroad, I ſtood indifferent, both in reſpect of our contreis good, and of my ovvne particular, both being able men to ſerve our countrey and my eſpeciall frends. Mary, yet to tell you the truth, I beleved as much then that Fa. Parſons should or vvould be Card. as I beleave novv the report of travaillers vvho advouch that M. Geffrey Poole or M. Tho. Fitsherbert shalbe Card. And although it might be true that Fa. Par. Hindred the B. all he coold, (for ſome iuſt cauſes beſt knovvne to thim ſelf) yet of this I am aſſured, that Fa. Par: had no vvill nor inten-

tion to procure it for him ſelf. For I ſavve a lettre vvritten from Rome by a dere and ſecret frend of his, that Fa. Par. vvith much adoe and traveill, and at the great ſuite of his Generall had miſſed or refuſed the redd cape, vvishing that ſome fit man of our nation had it. vvhich is an invincible argument to prove, that if Fa. Par. had had the vvill and intention to be Card. he should not haue had neade to employ all his frends to perſuade the Pope to the Contrarye.

The 5. fault fol. 6.

A nother fault is, your impertinent diſcourſe theare of the controuerſie of the English Gentlemen againſt Fa. Holt. Hovv doth this prove that vvhich you haue taken in hand? They vveare but ſome of the laitie in emulation againſt one religious man. It is a great fault of you throughout your vvholle booke, to ſtuffe it vp vvith impertinent matter. For if a man vvould make a table of your impertinent matters, tales, toies, and digreſſions, it vvould be bigger then half your booke. Well, theiſe Gentlemen accuſed Fa. Holt ād M. Ovven of parcialitie. Surely they might ſay true, for any thiug you bringe or prove to the contrary. Why should not I or any other Reader (I pray you) rather beleave vvorshippfull and Catho. Gentlemen affirmyng by vvords ād vvrittinge that they were partiall, then to beleeue you (vnited brethern) talking vvithout booke ād by heare ſay,

Impertinent matter.

vvithout any disproofe of that vvhich they say? men must beleeve all that cometh from you vvithout proof, who gaue you that priveledge?

At leugth you are come from Iohn of Gãt to Wisbish castle, and from the yere 1577. to the yere 1595. vvhen these sturres began there, hauing not (as you promise in this chapt.) brought any sufficient proof for 200. and odd yeres space to shewe what *great hurt the emulation of secular Priests against Religious hath brought to our countrey*. Both your bookes do testifie, that at that prison began all these vnfortunate and scandalous prison contencions. And although you attribute here, their living many yeres a religious life to haue happened by the *instructions of a Religious Father of the Societye*, yet after vvards (forgetting your selues) you attribute the cause of their so quiett living, to M. Licentiat Metham, and that it continuvved so long as he lived, and after this blessed mans death the sturres began. I aske you then if it be true, that for diuers yeres they had bene governed by Fa. Edmonds good instructions, how felit our they continevved not to harken still thereto? You answvere. D. Bagshaw began the diuision. *Ætatem habet*. Lett him answvere for him self. But I rather esteeme it to be that vvhich you say a litle before *the good Card. vvas dead*, vvhose auctoritye, as it keapt the Iesuits vnder,

Fol. 64.

Fol. 6. Contradiction Fol. 65.

Card. Allens death cause of the diuision.

ſo the reuerend reſpect that all Prieſtes bare him, as to their loving foſtering Father, made them depend vvholly on him, and to referre all their doubts and controuerſies to him, and not to Religious mē. But after his death, the Prieſtes like Fatherleſſe childrene, did ſeek helpe and confort vvhere they could find it. Some then liked this, ſome liked that, and ſo of diuers humors and liking grevv diſcontentment amongſt them, the vvhich drevve after it, this miſerable contention.

The 6. fault is irreuerence tovvards his holl. Fol. 7.

The 6. fault is, in ſpeaking ſo vnreverently of his Holl. (of vvhich irreuerēce tovvards their ſuperiors you often accuſe your diſcōtented bretherne) ſaying that *his holl. should be enforced afterwards to confirme their officers and Prelates.* An vndutifull ſpeach. hovv could his holl. (I pray you) be compelled by a companie of diſcontented bretherne, vvhich do not amount (ſay you) aboue the nomber of 30. to confirme the Prelats choſen by them? A ſtrang caſe, to ſee hovv great vvant of charity driveth men hedlong to ſuch vncomly ſpeaches, ād to bring their bretherne gods Prieſtes into contempt and diſcredit. The Prieſtes in their book to his holl. make mention of this Aſſociation, of their Rules and conſtitutions and lay dovvne their intentions in theſe vvords: *Sedi Apoſtolicæ confirmandas proponere decreveramus.* vve had decreed to preſent them (our Rules) to the Sea Apoſtlicke to be

confirmed. And afterwards talking of their Prelates or Bishopps they say: *Si quando id* (beatiſſ. Pater.) *tibi approbandum videretur.* If at any time it should haue seemed good to your Hollines to approue it, would these men compell the Pope to confirme their Prelats, who protest their association and Prelats to be of no value, nor their election of any force without the Popes confirmation? Many other thinges they say there, which you lett passe vntouched, and being not to my purpose, I omitt also.

You add, that when his *Hollines saw this mauer of proceading.* What mauer of proceading? Mary their new association, and that he should be enforced if they choose officers and Prelates, afterwards to confirme them, thought it was time to looke to the matter, and to preuent their force, by prouiding them of a Prelate of his owne making. Certes, your words must tend to this, or els to nothing. But his Holl. being in Rome, how could he see this maner of proceading in Ingland? Your discontended Bretherne attribut *Pag.* 23. it to the Iesuits and especially to Fa. persons, which you your selues do graunt here, but more modestly saying: *The Pope caused the Protector to call to him* Fa. *persons and other Englishmen in Rome.* which other Englishmen as you say afterwards were Fa. Baldwine and M. *Fol.* 98-*b.* Standish. one a Iesuit and thother a secular *Fol.* 7.

Informes. Fol. 99. Prieſt (being latly come ont of Ingland) each of them vrged the ſame (ſubordmation) in behalf both of th'one and th'other ordet. So you ſee theare are 2. Ieſuits and one ſecular prieſt to enforme of the maner of theeſe proceadings. Beſids theiſe, th'oppinions of M. Haddock, M. Martine Array, and M. Thomas Allene vveare asked in Rome. So that his holl. vvas informed by tvvoe Ieſuits and 3. Prieſts moſt affectioned (as all the vvorld knovveth) to the Ieſuits againſt the Aſſociation of the diſcontented bretherne. And as for M. Thomas Allene, as he is put laſt, ſo I deeme he vvas putt in to make vp an nombre, as a Cypher in Algoriſme. Let all men iudg vvhither your bretherne haue not cauſe to complaine, that the church of Ingland muſt be gouerned and ruled according to the iudgment and information of Ieſuits, the cauſe touching them not at all, but the ſecular Prieſts only, vvhich are neither called nor heard.

Fol. 7. b. Well it ſeamed good to theiſe 6. Englishmen to giue the Prieſts in Ingland a *Superior of their ovvne order*. Who ſhould not be a Bishopp, whoſe dignitie being *Culmen dignitatis* the higheſt order in gods church, vvould haue obſcured and dymmed (as your bretherne ſay) the eſtimation of the Fathers in Ingland, but an Archprieſt vvhoſe ordinarie office ād dignitie is the loweſt in gods churche.

Pag. 23.

The next concluſion in that Cõſultation of diuers moneths was, that it *vvas not thought expedient for his Holl. to vvrit him ſelf.* vvherfore? Mary, for the ſame cauſe and conſideration. what vvas that cauſe and conſideration? forſooth for the avoiding ſuſpitiõs and troubles of the *ſtate of Inglãd.* For no other cauſe or cõſideratiõ but this, you alleage before: for not having a Bishopp. Where were your wits when you vvrot this, vveare they a woolgathering? or do you not know, that all things that come from Rome are ſuſpected in Ingland and conſtrued to be againſt the ſtate? be he Archprieſt, or be he Bishoppe? or whither it come from Pope or Protector? either theiſe were not the conſiderations that moved the informers to informe, that it was not thought expediẽt for his *Holl: to vvrit him* ſelf, or els they weare of no force and effect, or afterwards reiected and neglected. For this notwith ſtanding it was thought afterwards expedient for his Holl. to write, and to ſend his Bulles (as he did). vveare not thoſe cauſes and conſiderations as forceable when his Holl. wrot, as before he wrot? yes, yes, you know it full vvel. But theare lay a padd in the ſtrawe, the which in time wilbe diſcouerd.

Toching M. Blackwell, whom you praiſe for quietnes, learning and vertue, true it is, that for ſuch a one he was taken before theiſe ſturres began, and for ſuch a one I haue *Fol.* 8.

knowne him many yeres together. And if the Bishop: or Archp. had bene made by election, I should haue giuen my voice to him, so soone as to any man I knovv in England. *honores mutant mores.* if all be true that is sett downe in the Priests appeale *Quantumque mutatus ab illo.* it is not the same M. Blackvvel. I knevv him to be (I must tell the truth for I looue not to flattet.) in those his answeres and doings he shevveth neither quietnes, modestie nor learning: but rather haughtines, seueritie and much indiscretion, tossing the censures of the church like tennis baules, for euery de faulte, threatning the taking avvay of faculties, Suspention, interdictiõ or excõmunication. Worthily vvas he cheaked in his Holl. last bull for his ouer much seueritie. In Prelats clemencie is extolled more then Severitie, *Plus erga corrigendos agat beneuolentia quã seueritas: plus cohortatio quam comminatio, plus charitas quam potestas.* Beneuolence (saith Pope Leo) worketh more vvith those that are to be corrected then seueritie: exhortation more then theatninges and charitie more then auctoritye. I leave to M. Blackwell to meditat that vvhich follovveth in the same Canon. If I had bine by him in Ingland I vvould haue vvished him to haue followed the example of S. Gregorye of Nazianzen. Who seing a contention amonge the Bishoppes about him, quitted rather the Arch-

M. Blackvvell faults.

Can licet. dist. 45

bishopps Sea of Constantinople, then to be cause of such sturres and contentions. So vvhen M. Blackvvell savve vvhat sturre and contention began to arise about his extraordinarre office, a man of his modestie in the time of persecution, the office being not profitable but dangerous should haue quitted it. But being *vvell vnited in loove and iudgment vvith the Iesuits* (*as you say here*) seeing they had procured him the dignitie, he wovld not leave it so easlye, but for the looue of them hold it, and for their sakes, to his no litle discredite, subscribe to the booke of schisme which the Iesuits wrote against the prests, which resisted him.

Next you talke of the 2. priests that were sent to Rome and there imprisoned. I meruaile how you can without blushing, twange so oft as you doe vpon this string, which soũdeth in euery mans eare, and worketh in euery mans hart (but your) pittie and compassion, as well for their vndue and vniust imprisonement, as that it should be thought that Fa. Parsons should procure it, as also for his Hol. degenerating so farre from his name of Clement and from all iustice and equitie, as to imprison (vnheard) such as came *ab vltimo orbe*, as appeallants to that Sea. But here parhaps you wil cry out and say that I do not respect his Hol. nor speake so reuerently of him as I ought. Whereto I answere. I beare

as great a reſpect and reuerence to his Holl. and his actions, as any of you do or can doe: But I cannot flatter as you doe but am. *Tom tel troth.* Is not his Hol. the ſupreame iudge on earth? Is he not bound to doe iuſtice? To obſerue his owne and his predeceſſors Conſtitutions and Decrees? Hath not god and nature giuen him 2. eares, to heare each partie? Is he not a mã and may be miſinformed? hath he not his paſſions as other men haue to credite one man more then a nother? If all this be true, as you cannot denie but that it is, if you be Chriſtians, Why might he not vniuſtly impriſon them, being preoccupied with euell and falſe informations? *Numquam eſt auditum à ſæculo.* ſpecially in Rome that men appealling to that Sea, weare impriſoned before they weare heard to ſpeake in their defence. In your next and larger Apolog. bring me one like example and I will yeld to you.

They weare there a fortnight (ſay you) before theiweare impriſonned. what if they had bene there a whoil yere, being not heard the time of their being there doth neither aggrauat their fault nor purge the iniuſtice of the fact. If they had ben hard and found faultie? All the world would haue liked of the iuſtice done to them, as now they miſlike of the iniuſtice shewed to them. the matter paſſing as it did, aſſure your ſelues, all the water in Tiber will neuer wash or cleãſe the Actors

herein of iniuſtice, nor ſtopp the mouthes of the poſteritie from ſpeaking againſt it, if it should be committed to memory and vvritinge as you hatie done here. It followethe. *That his Holl. tooke order that they should be retired to the English Colleage in Rome,* but in a nother place you ſay: it *vvas at Fa. Parſons Requeſt.* Retyred (quoth you) from ſuch retyring *Libera nos Domine.* If cloſe priſon be but a retraict, I know not what priſonmēt is? You do well to couer and mitigat ſo grat iniuſtice with ſo mild and fauorable a word as retyred is. Certz, they were retyred to the English colleage, as M. Bishopp was retyred in Ingland to the Marshallſea, and there put in cloſe priſon by an hereticall Iuſtice of peace. But to tell you more, this retyring of thē to the English colleage, was as great an iniuſtice as their apprehenſion was before they weare heard. What lavve doth permitt men to be impriſonned in the hovvſes of their aduerſaries? It is vvel knowe and you cannot denie, but that their comming to Rome was aſvvell againſt the Ieſuits as the Archpr. and ſpecialiy againſt Fa. Parſons, vnder vvhoſe cuſtodie they vvere impriſonned. In vvhat common vvealth vvell gouerned are priſonners committed to the keaping and cuſtodie of their aduerſaries? Why are common gailes built but to keape offendors ād malefactors? If you haue any like example in your next. *Fol. 8. b.*

for our ſatisfaction that doe miſlike of this dealing, bring vs one.

From fol. 120. downevvards. Aftervvards you treat more at large of this impriſonment. Cloak and diſguize it ſo vvell as you can novv, the poſteritie hereafter vvill vvonder to heare or reade that 2. cathol. prieſtes comming as appellants to Rome out of an hereticall coũtrey, in the vvhich they maintained conſtantly vvith danger of their liues, the honor and preminence of that Sea, and one of them had ſuffred ſomme yeres impriſonment vvith banishment aftervvards for the article of S. Peter and his ſucceſſors ſupremacie ouer all Princes and Prelats vvhoſoeuer, that theiſe prieſts (I ſay) ſhould before they vveare heard, what they had to ſay, be caſt into priſon, yea and impriſonned in the hovvſe and vnder the cuſtodie of their aduerſaries. Neuer vvas theare hard of ſuch iniuſtice ſince good S. Peter ſate in that chaire. Suerly, as ſtrange, vnvſuall ād neuer before hard of iudgment, as the appointment and inſtitution of the Archp. vvas, the vvhich they vvent to impugne. the maner and faſhion alſo of their impriſonment, to be keapt cloſe priſoners and not to ſee or communicate one vvith th'other for ſomme monethes, doth make the iniuſtice much more greater. Murtherers, manqnellers, and traitors are not euery vvhere, nor in common gailes ſo handled. They cam to pleade againſt

a nevv Prelacie inſtituted vvithout his Holl: bulls, and obteined (if not by evill) yet by the information of ſome fevve parſons. Was this ſo hainous a crime, that it should deſerue ſuch rigourous punishment? Are not his hol. bulles and breues euery daie almoſt in euery court impugned, and reiected vpon ſuch pretences as ſurreption and ill information? And yet ſuch reiectors are quietly heard, and neither impriſonned nor punished albeit they proue not their intention. Theſe men came but to impugne a Card. letters, and yet vvere haynouſly punished for it, before they vvere hard, and as though they had committed *Crimẽ leſæ Maieſtatis* vvere cõſtrained to anſvvere *ex vinculis*. Yea, but (ſay you) they *perſiſted to vvrangle, and vvent about to miſinforme diuers principall men of the citie of the affaires of Ingland and diuiſions.* bicauſe they informed othervviſe then the 3. prieſtes and 2. Ieſuite, before named had before informed it is miſinformyng. In deed they vvere not called by the Protector to counſell as the others vvere, but came to impugue the information giuen to him, and his appointment of the Archp. and therfore they vvere but vvrãglers and miſinformers? ſeeing you vvill haue it ſo, be it ſo. They paied vvell for their vvrãgling. *Fol.* 121.

After you haue told the tale as cunningly and as ſmoothly as you can in defence of the

Agents and actors of this impriſonment, you fall a mockinge the poore prieſtes ſaying. *this then is the hainous fact vvhich our diſcontented bretherne ſince that time haue ſo much aggrauated through the vvorld by clamors, and doe at this preſent both amplifie aud vrge in theſe their bookes againſt his Holl: the Card. and ſpecially Fa: Parſons, &c.* Come hither (I pray you) Is it not a hainous fact to committ iniuſtice and to impriſon innocent parſons vnheard? that they vvere innocent the time of their impriſonement (how ſoeuer they vvere found guiltie afterwards) is notorious to all men, for in lavv, *Quilibet præſumitur bonus vſque dum probetur malus.* Euery one is preſumed to be an honeſt and innocent man, vntill he be proued to be an naughtie fellovve, but nothing vvas proued againſt them before their impriſonment, ergo honeſt and innocent men vveare impriſonned. If this be not a hainous fact, I knovv not vvhat is a hainous fact. Haue ſo much aggrauated? (quoth you) if men had not vttered it, the ſtones themſelues vvould haue cried out againſt it, and (as I haue ſaid) all poſterity heare after vvill no doubt vvonder at it? Call you the ſetting dovvne of the truthe exaggeration? That 2. prieſtes comming out of Ingland to Rome vvith appellation, vveare caſt into priſon, before they vveare heard, vvhat they had to ſay, and that in ſuch haſt, as they muſt needs

be caught and carried to priſon on S. Thomas of Canterbury his day, a day ſo highly ſolemnished troughout all Chreſtiendome of all Englishe Catholickes, vvhere any companie of them dvvell or Remaine? then, to be impriſonned in the hovvſe of thoſe, againſt vvhō they came to cōteſt? Next to be keapt cloſe priſoners ſome monethes, not to be permitted to ſpeak one vvith a nother, nor to companie or haue conference (vvhat ſay I vvith any Aduocat or Procureur for their inſtruction) no not vvith any English in the tovvne or ſcholler in the colleage, no not to be ſuffred to goe to Chureh, to ſay or heare Maſſe vpon Sondaies, *Nevv yares daie and tvvelf daie?* is this to aggrauat the matter? Thinke they to dazell mens eies by ſaying: They aggrauat the matter? haue they not iuſt cauſe to cry out, and notifie the iniuſtice to the vvhole vvorld? yea, but they vrgè it againſt his Hol. the Card. and Fat. Parſons as vvho ſhould ſay his Holl. the Card. and Fat. parſons vveare Angels ad not ſinfull men, or ſuch as could doe no iniuſtice, that haue not their paſſions and affections a ſvvell as other men? as vvho ſhould ſay, his holl. cannot err and miſſe in matters of fact, ſuch as this is? by creditinge one partie too much, and by preiudicing thother partie? By theſe great braggs you vvould, terrifie your reader, and dravve him from the due codſideration of the fact it

ſelf. But all in vaine, vve knovv as vvell as you vvhat is due to his Holl. and Cardinals vvithout flattering thé, as you do to your owne and other mens hurts.

Fol. 123. Next your anſvvere to their poore obiections that, *if they came to trouble that church of Ingland: his Hollines might vvell determine to reſtraine them for their diſobedience at their firſt arrivall.* Which is a poore anſvvere. For had they come to trouble 20. churches, yet they ought to be heard before impriſonment. For hovv could his Holli knovv they came to trouble the church of Ingland, before they vveare heard to ſpeak againſt that churche? you vvill anſvvere: his holl: knevv it by heare ſay. And vpon hearſay innocent men be impriſonned. And might not theſe informatiõs he had out of Ingland and Flaunders (eſpecially being giuen by thoſe of the contrary faction) be falſe? Good God? my iudg is informed againſt me by myne aduerſarie againſt vvhõ I plead, the iudge giveth eare and credit to his information and vvil not heare me ſpeake and defend my ſelf, but condemneth me to priſon. Is not this good iuſtice thinck you? And yet this is the caſe of the tvvoe prieſts. Information vvas made againſt them to his Hollines by the contrarie faction, vpon vvhich information, vvithout hearinge their defences, they vvere condemned and caſt into priſon in ſuch order as you haue heard.

And

And as for that which you add in defence of this fact, that this a is courſe vſually held in all Princes courts of the world at this day, viz to impriſon a man firſt & thé heare him after: as they doe in kendall, hange a man in the forenoone, and ſit in iudgment of him in the afternoone, if it were true in temperall princes courtes, yet the Sea of Rome neuer vſed any ſuch courſe before in Church matters as theſe are, neither in any Princes courte in the world, are men priſoned in ciuil matters, ſuch a one as this is, before they be heard. Nay, I ſay more, that ordinarily in criminall cauſes there is made a ſecret inquirie of the life ād behauior of the accuſed by the Princes officers before the delinquant be apprehended and impriſoned. And weare it true you ſay of Princes courtes, I anſwere you: *Non ita in Eccleſiaſt. agendū eſt negotiis ſicut in ſecularibus.* Eccleſiaſticall affaires (quoth the Pope Eutichianus) muſt not be handled as ſecular affaires are handled. *Can. non ita. 2. q. 6.*

The 7. fault, is that you promiſſe in this firſt chap. to ſett doWne *the ſtate of the preſent cõtrouerſie in queſtion.* and yet you do nothing leſſe but throughe out this whole booke you shūne it and fly from the points in queſtion, as from a ſnake or ſerpent. *The 7. fault. The ſtate of the queſtion not ſett dovvne as you promis.*

Your diſcontented brethrene in the preface of their English booke put it downe thus: The ſtrief and diſſention at this day, &c. is a-

„ gainſt thoſe prieſts who did forbeare to ſub-
„ iect them ſelues to the Archp. conſtituted in
„ auctoritie ouer all the Seminary prieſtes in
„ England and Scottland by a Card. who was
„ Protector of the English colleage at Rome,
„ and afterwards honored with the title of Pro
„ tector of Ingland, for the which forbearing
„ &c. the Prieſtes were accuſed of ſchiſme, ſe-
„ dition, faction and rebellion. &c.

Loe how plainly they goe to work, wher as you ſtill roue abrode, and will not come neare the prick. You should haue confuted this, and putt the caſe more truer if you could They did putt it more largly downe to the D. D. of Sorbonne which you miſlike and finde 5. faults therewith. Therfore being parciall to neither ſide, I will put it downe truly and as it is in deed.

Fol. 116.117.
*Fol.*7.
The true caſe of the firſt controuerſie in queſtiõ

When his Holl. ſaw the proceadings of the prieſts in Ingland *touching their aſſociatiõ and endevours* to make them ſelues officers and Prelats of their owne inſtitution. *He vvilled the Card. and Protector to call vnto him fath. parſons and other English men in Rome, to ſee vvhat remedie vvas beſt for theis diſorders.* Where it was concluded that the prieſts should haue a ſuperior of their owne order, and for ſomme cauſes, it was not thought good that this Superior should be a Bishopp but an Archp. with 12. aſſiſtants, and for ſome conſiderations it was not thought expedient

that he should be instituted or constituted by his Hol. his bulles. Where vpon his Holl. gaue full and expresse commission to Cardinall Caietane the Protector to appoint the same with conuenient instructions. The protector according to his commission appointed and constituted M. Blackwell Archpriest with as grat iurisdiction ouer Ingland, and also Scotland as al the Bishopps of those 2. realmes had before. The Card. letters wherin he said he did this *Ex expresso mandato Sanctißimi*. by the expresse commandement of his Hol: being receiued in Ingland and communicated to the priestes. *The Archp. vvas receued and obayed vvillingly and ioyfully by the English clergie, excepting only a fevve that misliked the facte, bicause it hindred their association. And for that the Archp. being a quiet learned and vertuous man, and vvell vnited in loue and iudgmẽt vvith the Iesuits, they mistrusted euer to be able to dravve him to be indifferẽt and for that cause deuised many scrupulls and lets, partly of the faith and credence of the said Card. letters, then vvhither his Hol. could (according to the canons and constitutions of his Predecessors and according to the vvrittẽ lavve and style of the court of Rome) institute a nevv office and dignitie neuer hard of before in Christs churche in respecte of his large and ãple iurisdiction, by that meane, that is, by the letters of a Protectour vvithout his Holl. bulles?*

Fol. 116. b.

Fol. 7. b

Fol. 8.

This is the case sett downe plainly and trulye
Now the question is.

First question. First. whither a Card. Protector is to beleued vpon his worde, saying: that he hath expresse commandment from his holl: to doe this or that?

2. Next whither not only a new and extraordinary dignitie, (as this is for his ample iurisdiction) but any other benefice or dignitie what so euer, cã be made, Instituted or giuen to anye, or by any other meanes, then by the Popes expresse bulls and breues?

3. Thirdly whither those parsons vpon whõ such a superior is putt and thrust, may not, yea are not bounde in lawe and cõscience to withstãd him and not to admit or accept him?

4. Fourthly Whither a man put in possession of a dignitie or benefice by other meanes thẽ the Popes expresse bulles, be not an intruded parson: that is, an vninst possessor of that dignitie or benefice?.

5. Fiftly, Whither our English cletgie that receued him and obayed him so willingly and Ioyfully did not offend against his Hol. constitutions and are punishable by lawe for it, or no?

Fol. ibid.b Lastly, Whither those few priestes that misliked the fact, and would not admitt such a Superior thrust vpon them by such letters, without his Holl. bulles, did synne, or weare to be counted and proclaimed Schismaticks

and worſe then ſoothſaiers for the ſame.

Theiſe queſtions touch the quick of the firſt controuerſie in queſtion by the deciſion of the which, you and your reader shall ſee and perceiue (if they be not ſtark blinded) whither the fault was in your diſcontented bretherne that refuſed to receiue the Archp. and to acknowledg him their Superior vpon the Card. Protectors letters, written as he ſaid *ex expreſſo mandato Sanctiſſimi*, or in the Archpr. that would accept and occupie ſuch a dignitie vpon ſuch letters: or in you (vnited brethrene) that vpon ſuch letters did hazard ſo willingly and ioyfully to receiue the Archp. and by this your Apologie goe about to auerr and allowe of the ſame.

For the deciſiõ of the firſt queſtion. Fol.108. b

Touching the firſt queſtion. It ſeemeth that a Card. Protector is to be beleaued vpon his worde, by the text, gloſſe and reaſõ which you alledg for the ſaime. For the Canon Nobiliſſimus diſt. 97. doth report that the Pope receiued a Princes Ambaſſador as Ambaſſador, and beleaued all he tould him in his Maiſt. name that ſent him, albeit he brought no letters of credence from the Prince that ſent him. Ergo if the Pope him ſelf did beleaue an Ambaſſador without letters from his Prince, why should not a few ſecular prieſtes beleaue a Card. their Protect. affirming, that what, ſoeuer he did, was done by his Hol. expreſſe eommandmẽt, allthongh he shewed

For the Cardin. and Archp.

no letters from his Hol. for confirmatiõ thereof. Now if the Pope beleued a man of farre leſſe qualitie, dignitie and credite then a Card. (yea a Card. Protector of the wholl nation to whom he wrott) is, and that without letters vpon his bare worde: per argumentũ à minore ad maius, certs, prieſts ought to haue beleued a Card. Protector being of ſo eminent a dignitie as (vnder his HOL.) theare is no higher in gods church, and by conſequence theiſe few ſecular prieſts did not well in not beleauing the Card. and in withſtanding and not acknowledging the Archp. conſtituted by him, by the expreſſe commandment of his holl: as by his letters he affirmed and teſtified.

Fol. ibidem. Ad C. vnic. in extr. Joann. 22. de præbend. in verb. ſublimitatis.

The gloſſe by you alleaged recke nyng vp many priuiledges that Card. haue above other prelates in the 8. priuiledg ſaith, that a Card. ſaying him ſelf to be the Popes legat, is to be beleued without any letters at all. But Caietanus who inſtituted the Arch. was a Card. and which is more Protector of the contrey in the which he inſtituted that dignitie. Ergo he was to be beleued without letters, ſaying he did it by the expreſſe commandment of his holl. I ſee no reaſon of diuerſitie. For why is not this Card. aſwell to be beleaued ſaying he did this by this holl commandment, as the other Card. ſaying he is the Popes legate, till you diſcontented bretherne bring me, ſome reaſon of diuerſitie, I muſt conclude thone to

be as well beleeued as th'other, and ſo both to beleeued without letters, on their bare words, and by conſequẽce, you to haue offẽded in not beleeuing him, and in not admittinge the Archp. vpon his letters, atteſting it to be done by his hol. expreſſe cõmandment.

This reaſon alſo, is againſt the diſcontented bretherne *vvho doth not knovve vvhat a Card. teſtimonie in any Chriſtian Catho. court is vvorthe? eſpecially a Protector teſtifying and profeſsing in his letters to doe it by the ſpeciall commandement of his Hol. as this man dooth in this letters?* If then Card. be beleeued in Chriſtian Princes courtes, vpon their words, why doe you poore prieſtes call his credit in queſtion, vvhy doe you not obay him, thinck you that your diſobedience is of greater force to diſcredit him, then the obedience of all Chriſtian Princes is to geue credite to his vvotde and teſtimonie, you are farre deceeued if you thinck ſo. *Fol.* 108.

This is all (my vnited Bretherne) that you haue ſaid or can ſay in the defence of the inſtitution of the Archp. by the Protectors letters ex mandato Sanctiſſimi. I haue vrged your arguments ſyncerely, and as farre (I thinck) as you can doe your ſelues, and yet for all that, your allegations doe not proue your intention nor diſproue the fact and doing of your diſcontented bretherne. If you haue no better ſtuff to bring in, in your next and larger Apologie, I muſt needs pronoun-

ce you to haue an iniuſt cauſe in hand, and theſe fevv prieſtes againſt vvhom you vvrit, to gaine the victory of you. and to haue done like good childrene of Gods Churche, in obſeruing her ordonance and Conſtitutions by reiecting Superioritie ſo vnduly and vncanonically putt vpon them: and you to be (as it vveare) baſtards, ſo vvillingly and ioyfully to receiue an intruded parſon thruſt in vpon you againſt the Ordinanances, Decrees, Conſtitutions and Canons of Gods Churche, as anone shall appeare.

The text, gloſe ād reasō brought for the Cardin. doing make not for him.

The Canon Nobiliſſimus is ſo farre from making for you, that it vtterlye ouerthroveth the Conſtitution of the Archp. and doth proue that a Card. be he Protector of ten Realmes is not to be beleeued except he shew his holl. letters. This saith the Canon: *Nobiliſſimus vir atque ſtrenuus veſtræ ſublimitatis Legatus licet nullam epiſtolam iuxta conſuetudinem à vobis noſtro Pontificio detuliſſet, licet nnnquam Apoſtolicæ Sedis modus fuit abſque ſignatis apicibus vndecumque legationem ſuſcipere: nos tamen vos in illo honorantes eiuſque grauitatem & eloquiorum illius veridicas cognoſcentes aſſertiones, nihilominus eum & ſicut decuit ſuſcepimus, & ei ſicut honeſtum fuit credidimus.* Thus farre Pope Nicholas, Which is to say. All though the moſt noble and valiant man your highnes Legat

brought no letters from you vnto vs, and albeit it vvas neuer the maner of the Apoſtolick Sea to receive any Ambaſſage from vvhat place ſoeuer vvithout ſigned or ſealed letters, yet that notvvith ſtanding, as it became vs we haue receiued him, (without letters) and as honeſtie required vve haue beleeved him. Honoring you in his perſon, and his grauitie acknowledging his aſſertions to be true. If this Canon proue any thiuge, it is this: that the Sea Apoſtolick neuer vſed to receaue Ambaſſadors from Princes vvithout letters of credence ſigned or ſealed by the Prince thet ſendeth ſuch Ambaſſador, ād that the ſame Sea neuer ſendeth Ambaſſador or giueth commiſſion to any whoſoeuer vvithout letters from the ſame Sea. And therfore the Card. Protector by this Canon vvas not to be beleeued Sine ſignatis apicibus, that is without the Popes bull or breue. And by conſequence this Canon brought by you doth diſcharge your diſcontented bretherne from all diſobedience, and charg your owne ſelues vvith ouer muche lightnes to admitt a Superior vpon a Card. lettre without letters from the Sea Apoſtlick. which as your Canon proveth is not accouſtomed to giue Commiſſion to any man vvithout letters ſigned. The truth is, this Canon neither maketh for th'one, nor againſt th'other, for it ſpaketh in a caſe farre different from this

that is in queſtion. For it treatethof ſending Ambaſſodors to the court of Rome,and our queſtiō is of ſending from Rome. And wheras Gratian a litle before this Canon by you alleadged, ſaid: *That it vvas not the cuſtome of the church of Rome either to receeve Ambaſſadors from any place,or to ſend Ambaſſadors or Legates to any place vvithout letters ſigned or ſealed:* And for proof therof alleadged the vvords of Pope Nicholas: the Correctors of the decret appointed,and after approved by Gregory the 13. Do takaway theis words. (Or to ſend.) *In vulgatis ſequebatur: Neque mittere, quæ abſunt à vetuſtis neque conveniunt cum his quæ ſequenti Capite afferuntur.* That is. In the vulgar copies it did followe, *Neither to ſend*, vvhich words are not in the ancient copies, neither do they agree with thoſe thinges that are treated in the chap.followving. vvhich chapter is your Canon Nobiliſſimus. And vvhy do not thoſe vvords agre vvith that vvhich is treated in that chapter? Bicauſe that chapter treateth of ſending Ambaſſadors to Rome and not of ſending Legats or Ambaſſadors from Rome, and ſo the caſe is altered (quoth Ploydon.) Your Canon ſaith that the Pope of courtiſie extraordinarily and againſt the cuſtome of that Sea receivedan Ambaſſador that came without any letters of credence. This is all. Hovv proverh it that the Prorector was to be beleeved without letters vpon his ovvne

woorde that he did it by expreſſe commandement from his Holl. ? even as much as: Hovv farre is it to london ? A poake full of plumbes.

Novv to your Gloſſe. Who if it had not had the chyn coughe, and that it had not bene (at it vveare) throatled by you, leaſt it should haue ſpoken out, vvould not haue made muche for you. *You haue throatled this gloſſe.*

The 8. priuilege (ſaith the Gloſſe) is, *a Cardinall ſaying him ſelf to be the Popes Legat is to be beleeved vpon his vvorde. allthough he ſome call this priveleag in doubt.* vvhich latter words you nipped quiteof, bicauſe they marred the markett. If you had putt them dovvne, your Reader vvould ſtraight haue ſeene, that that priveledg vvas not ſo firme and ſtable, that you should build any ſolide or firme Doctrine vppon it, as in deed it is built vpon a heape of ſande, and not vpon a Rocke, as you shall ſee anon, after the anſweare to your reaſon. *You are nippers.*

Why (my vnited brotherne) this is falshood in fellowshipp to deceiue your ſelues voluntaryly, (for you could not but ſee theiſe vvords if you ſaw the other) and your vnlearned Reader (that vvould not ſeek the gloſſe, but credit you vpon your vvorde) vvillingly, I will not ſay malliciouſly. you muſt in your next Apologie confeſſe here vvhither you will or no, either your igno- *No vpright dealing.*

rance or your mallice. Ignorãce for alleaging vntruly an Author you neuer ſavve, mallice, if you ſavve him, ãd yet alleage him corruptly, in cutting of that which confuteth the thing, for the which you alleage him. This is no nevves to you for elſwheare you do the like, as in place you shall heare of. This is to immitate Iewell and Novvell and not Cath. Writters.

Your reaſon holdeth not.

That your reasõ is not good ãd that it holdeth not in any Chriſtian and Catho. Courts (as you vvould make men beleeue) is proved out of Robuffus a French man, who was a great Practicioner in the court of Rome and Fraunce, and a Learned Canoniſt. He ſaith thus: *Secundum praxim in Francia non creditur Legato a latere aſſerenti ſe viuæ vocis oraculo diſpenſandi vel aliam poteſtatem a Papa habere, niſi eam oſtendat, & in Parleamentis eius poteſtas regiſtretur, &c.* According to the practize of France a Legat of Latere is not to be beleeved affirming that by worde of mouth he hath power from the Pope to diſpence, or to haue any other auctoritye, except he shenw it, and that his auctoritye and povver be regiſtred in the parliaments.

In concord. in rubr. de regia ad Prelaturas? verb. Certa.

This is taken out of a booke dedicated to Fraunces the firſt king of France, whom I truſt you vvill graunt to haue bene a good Chriſtian and Catholike kinge.

Fol. 108. So that your *vvho doth not knovv*, pro-

vethe your intention nothing at all. for if a Legat of latere be not beleeved, whē he ſaith he hath ſome ſpecially auctoritye given him by mouth from his holl. how vvould a bare Card. or a Protector be beleeved in the like caſe? And ſuer I am neither Legat nor Protector should be beleeved in Spaigne or elsvvhere in our caſe, which is the Inſtitution of a new office or dignitie, that neuer vvas ſeen in Chriſte his church before, without expreſſe letters from his Hollines.

Novv to returne to your gloſſe which ſaith: *Licet aliqui hoc revocent in dubium* althoughe ſome call this in doubt. for *aliqui*, ſome, he might haue better ſaid, omnes. All interpreters call it in doubt. *The gloſſe.*

First and foremoſt then, the firſt gloſſe vppon your Canon Nobiliſſimus ſaith: *here it is proved that Legats are not to be credited vvithout letters*, and ſo condempneth the ſaid 8. priveleage. *Againſt the Inſtitution of the Archprieſt.*

The ſecond gloſſe theare addeth: *A Legat then or Ambaſſador muſt shevv and exhibite the letters of his Legation, if he vvilbe beleeved.* You ſee by this that your gloſſe ſaid vvell: *Some doe call this in doubt.*

To this gloſſe I add the opinion of Bartolus the Prince of Ciuilian Interpretors. the Emperor forbidding all men to pay any tovvle or taxe *ad ſolas prefecturæ lettras*, vpon the Capitaine of the Garde (vvho vvas the *L. Vnic. C. de ſuperindicto lib. 1.*

next perſon to the Emperour in auctoritye) his letters, except theyweare cõfirmed by the Emperors letters, ſaith thus: *Canoniſta tamen dicunt quod Cardinalibus creditur etiamſi literas non oſtendant, &c.* The Canoniſts do hold that credit ought to be given to Cardinalls, although they shewe no letters for it. vvhich is flatt againſt the text of this lavve, by which faith is not given to the Capitaine of the guarde or Conſtable vpon his owne letters without he shewe alſo the Emperors letters. ergo a Card. is not to be credited vnleſſe he shewe the Popes letters, the which Cardinall Caietane did not. ergo.

Notes vppon Bartolus.

The Lawier that maketh notes or additions vppon Bartolus in the ſame place, noteth full well, that the lawe cited is to be vndreſtood of ſuch things as are due to the Prince only to doe, or are reſerued only to his auctoritye, as the impoſing of taxe, tributes and gabells vpon the ſubiects belonge only to the Prince, and no man els of vvhat preheminence or dignitie ſo euer he be, can doe it. And therefore (quoth he) *Si quis dicebat ſe habere talem promiſſionem a Principe, non eſt dubium, quod non creditur ſine literis, & maxime quando certatur de preiudicio alterius.* if any man should ſay, he had permiſſion of the Prince (to tovvle or taxe the ſubiects) without all doubt he is not to be beleeved, without the Princes letters and chiefly vvhen that vvhich

he ſaith he may doe, is preiudiciall to others. Mark hovv he ſaith. *If the thing belong to the Prince onely.* But the inſtituting of new offices and dignities, belonge to his Holl. only as alſo doe the collations of benefices depending of his gyſte, and not to Cardinalls Protectors or Cardinalls Legats, vnleſſe it be expreſſely ſett downe in the faculties of their legation. ergo there ought no credit to be given to the Protectors letters, inſtituting a new dignitie vvithout shevving his Holl. letters for diſcharge, and by conſequent the diſcontented bretherne in lawe and conſcience did vvell, not to admitt the Archprieſt as their Superior vpon the Cardinalls letters: and you (vnited bretherne) did againſt lavve and right to admitt him ſo lightly and vvillingly as you did.

C. 10. ext. de tranſlat. Epi.

Iaſon alſo a Learned Ciuilian after he had alleaged (according to his cuſtomet) the opinions of all that vvrot before him at laſt cõcluded: *Quod ſi etiam Cardinalis a latere diceret Papam ſibi aliquid commiſiſſe quod reſpicit damnum & preiudicium tertij non creditur ſibi, niſi Bullas Apoſtolicas commiſſionis oſtendat & ita procedit Gloſſa ad ca. Nobiliſſimus diſt. 97.* If a Card. yea a Card. Legate should ſay that the Pope (by mouth) hath committed ſome thiug to him that is hurtfull to a third perſon, he is not to be beleeved, except he shevve the Popes Bulles of his Commiſsion, and ſo ought the

Iaſon.

In repetit. Li. admonnendi ff. de iureiur. 11. 189.

glosse vpon the Canon *Nobilissimus* to be vnderstoode, he meaneth the third glosse vpon the same, which saith thus: *Credit ought to be giuen to a Card. that is vvel knovvne in any Prouince vvithout any letters at all. Maxime cum non contingat Cardinalem vnquam abesse nisi Legationis causa.* Chiefly, bicause it doth not lightly happen a Card. to be absent (from the court of Rome) but when he is seent in Legation. Besids Petrus Rauenatus a singuler good lawier, is of the opinion of the glosse, that a Card. is to be beleived affirming him self to be the Popes Legate, bicause customably Cardinalls do not depart from the court of Rome, except he be made a Legate. But both are to be vndrestood as Iason saied before, *except that vvhich they say be preiudiciall to others.* And besids, they talke of Cardinalls which be out of Rome that are presumed to be Legats. And our Card. was still in Rome, and so the case is altered.

Petrus Rauenatus. In breuiario Juris Can. tit. ext. de foro competent.

Andreas Alciatus also saith: Neque Cardinali creditur in alicuius preiudicium. Neither is a Card. to be credited in an others preiudice. Note he speaketh in general of all Cardinalls be they Legats, Protectors or not. To conclude with Civilians. The Emperors their lords and Maisters say: Si quis asserat &c. If any affirme that he commeth to *you vvith our secreat commandements, be it knovvento you all, that you give no credit therto, except he prove it by*

Alciat ad C. cũ contingat in 11. 35. ext. de Iure-iurand.

The Emperors. l. vnic. C. de mandat. princip.

it by shevvinge our letters. And be you not terrified vvith the dignitie or peruissante of any man, but aske hardly for our letters. This then you see is a rule in lavve, that none that say they haue this commandement from the Prince, or, the Prince hath given me this office or auctoritye to constitute such an office or officer are to be beleeved, except they shevve the Princes letters for it. Card. Caietane did not shevve his Holl. letters for the auctoritye he tooke vpon him in constituting the Archp. ergo by lavve he vvas not to be beleeved or credited, nor the Archp. vpon his letters only to be received or admitted. Let vs novv heare vvhat the Canonistes saye.

Petrus Rauenatus in the place before alleaged saith: *Si autem diceret, &c.* But if he (the Card. Legat) *should say that some thinge vvere specially committed to him, vvhich is not conteined in his faculties, Commission, or generall office of his Legation, he is not to be credited, except he shevve his letters. This not vvhithstandinge some doe saye: That by custome credit is to be given to him, yea in an other mans preiudice, vvhen he affirmeth some thing to be committed to him by vvorde of mouth. But the Abbot Panormitanus doth not beleeve it, forvvhom is a notable a glosse. and for my part I am of his opinion and doe alleage a singuler text, vvhich is alleaged ordinarily to proue, that the Pope cannot make a lavve: that faith be giuen to one in the preiudice of an other.* Thus he.

Petr. Rauenatus. againe.

a. In c. sicut extr. de sent. excom.

Panormit ad. d. c. sicut.

But let vs heare Panor. the Prince of Canonists speake: Nota singulariter, &c. Note singularly, that a Card. is not to be beleeved affirming any thinge in the preiudice of an other. And therfore if a Card: should say, that the Pope committed some thinge to him by vvorde of mouthe (*vvhich is all one vvith expresse commandement*) tending to an others preiudice, he is not to be beleived, except he proveth it othervvise. keepe in mynde this Glosse, vvhich doth notably limitate the Canon Nobilissimus. And allthough Nauarre doth seeme to advouch and hold, that a Card. is to be beleived euen in an others mans preiudice, yet he saith, three thingh must concurre. The first that he testifie of things committed to him by the Pope, or to be sēt to others by him. The second. That they be things accustomed, to be graunted. The third. That it turne not directly to the preiudice of an other. Novv as the first point might helpe the Protector, so the tvvo others make directly against him. So that in effect Nauar, saith as much as th'others doe, that a Card. is not to be beleved in the preiudice of another

Nauar. In consil. 12. tit. de testatis.

Reasons vvhy a Card. nor any other is to be beleeved on his vvorde.

The reasons vvhy a Card. is not to be beleived on his only vvorde, is: bicause the lawe doth forbidd *Any credit to be giuen to the vvorde or saying of oue Iudge, of vvhat soeuer auctorityе he be. And that no Iudge doe easely suffree the testimonie of one alone in vvhat cause soeuer, to be*

C. Cum a nobis ext. de test.

admitted. And againe. We *vvill not that the de-* *L. Iurisiur. C. de testib.*
position of one vvitnes be heard at all although he be *Ca. si testes*
of great honor in the court. For in such a case the *Par. vnius 4.*
Card. should beare vvittnes in his ovvne cau- *q. 3.*
se vvhich cannot be, bicause, *Nullus idoneus te-* *L. Nullus ff.*
stis in re sua intelligitur. No man is counted a *de testibus.*
lavvfull vvitnes in his owne cause. For by the
lawe of god and nature (vvhich neither Pope
nor Protector can change) it is decreed:
that in *ore duorum aut trium stet omne verbum.*
Theare must at the lest be tvvo vvittnesses
to proue the thinge that is in controuersie.
Alexander the 3. after he had alleaged the fo-
resaid vvords, addethe: *Quia licet quædam sunt* *C. Licet. ext. de*
causæ, quæ plures quam duos exigant testes, nulla ta- *testib.*
men est causa quæ vnius testimonio (quamvis legiti-
mo) terminetur. For albeit theare be some cau-
ses that require more then tvvoe vvittnes-
ses, yet there is no cause that cā be ended or
decided by the wittnes of one alone, be such
witnes neuer so lavvfull. And to end this cō-
trouersie vvith Pope Bonifacius the 8. say-
ing: *Nec simpliciter creditur se asserenti Legatum.* *C. Iniunctæ par.*
Nor is he to be beleived that saieth simplie *asserenti in ext.*
(vvithout our letters) he is a Legat. Marke *com. de elect.*
hovv he speaketh indefinitly, vvithout ad-
ding vvhether it be in the preiudice of an o-
ther or noe, he is not at all tobe credited with-
out letters from the Pope. By this that hath
bene said you see, that your discontēted bre-
therne had iust cause and good reason not to

beleve the Card. Protector vvithout the Popes Bulls, and therfore might well say, that they vvere not bound to beleeue him vvith the reſt that followveth in your 17. leafe b. put dovvne by you as not vvell ſpoken, vvhen as it is the truth it ſelf, as you ſee hath bene heare proved.

But novv vvhen I haue all done, you will ſay: the Prieſts in Ingland vvere not preiudiced by the Card. letters, and therfore by the opinion of the Authors by me alleged, they ought to haue beleeved and obaied the Card. affirming to haue done that vvhich he did by the expreſſe commandement of his Hollines. My vnited bretherne, my Authors do not ſay that he is to be beleeved vvhen that vvhich he ſaith is not preiudiciall to an other. But they ſay: he is not to be beleeved *maxime* chiefly vvhen he doth therby preiudice an other. vvhich vvord maxime doth not include, that if he doe not preiudice any he is then to be beleeved. And beſids Bonifacius ſaieth ſimply: *He is not to be beleeued vvithout letters.* It importeth not then vvhither this action did preiudice the Prieſtes or no. but vvhither he vvas to be beleeved and obayed therin vvithout the Popes letters? But novv, if all the Prieſts in Ingland vveare preiudicied in this action, then muſt you hold downe your hedds for ſhame and graunt you vveare too haſtie to admitt' ſuch a ſuperior to be putt v-

Anſvveare.

vpon you to your owne preiudice.

That you and your bretherne vvere preiudicied by this ſubordinatiõ ſo inſtituted by the Card. letters may eaſely be proved thus. Euery Superior as Pope, Archbishop, Bishope, Deane, Prouoſt, Abbott Abbeſſe and ſome ſort of Priors *De iure communi & ordinario*, by the ordinary and common courſe of lavve ought to be choſen by thoſe, ouer whome they are afterwards to gouerne. This is proved by the generall title *de electione* of election vvhich is put aſvvell in the Decretalls as in the Clementins and extrauagants. in vvhich title are ſett dovvne many notable conſtitutions touching the maner, order and direction of theis elections. And that in Ingland elections haue had place is euident, by ſome conſtitutions directed to the Archb. of Canterbury, the B. of vvorceſter, and others, to end ſome Difficulties vvhich aroſe vpon elections there. Beſids this his Holl. asked M. Standish vvho vvas nevvly come out of Ingland vvith Fa. Baldwine, whither the deſiere to haue a ſuperior as he then informed him, was by the conſent of all the Prieſtes in Ingland, or no? vvho anſvvered that it was. And vpon this information of Fa. perſons and Fa. Baldwine (as you confeſſe) it was reſolued to giue the Prieſtes for Superior an Archp. but not a Bishop. That queſtion of his Holl. vvas an euident ſigne and token

That all Prieſt in Ingland vvere preiudicied by this Inſtitution.

Tit. de elect. ext. in 6. in clo. & in ext.

Pag. 31.

that his Holl.meaned not to giue them a ſuperior vvithout their conſents, nor to take away the right of election that vvas due vnto them by his predeceſſors decrees and Conſtitutions. For to vſe Gregorye the 9. his words,talking of this matter of election. *Neque enim credendū eſt Romanum Pontificem(qui iura tuetur) quod alias excogitatum eſt multis vigilijs & inuentum,vno verbo ſubuertere voluiſſe.* It is not credible that the B.of Rome(who doth defēd the lawes)would with one vvorde ouer throvve, that vvhich otherwiſe with much paine and care hath bene excogitated and invented.Euen ſo I ſay,the Popes holl,is not to be preſumed vvith one vvorde ſaid to the Protector, to take a vvay the right of election,vvhich by lawe belonged to the Prieſts in Ingland: ſpecially being informed (thoughe falſely) that all the Prieſtes conſented therto. Vppon which information, thinking they vvere contented that his holl. should appoint them a Superior, he appointed then one. Beſides you muſt learne, that all that vvhich his Holl. decreeth or granteth by his Bulls,and commandements is all waies to be vndreſtood. *Saluo iure alieno,& ſine alterius detrimento*, ſauing other mens right and vvithout the hurt and hinderacem of others. *Noſtræ (inquit) intentionis non eſt Epiſcopo preiudicium generare.* It is not our intention to preiudice the B. ſaith Alexander the

C.Eccleſia 2. verſ.neque enim ext.de elect.

C. Licet ext. de officio iud. ordinand.

3.) And Innoceutius the 3. vvritting to the Archb. of Sens in France ſaith. *Quia tamen intentionis noſtræ nec fuit nec eſſe debuit Iuriſdictioni tuæ per mandatum huiuſmodi derogare.* Bicauſe it neither was, nor ought to be our intention by this commandement to derogat thy Iuriſdictione. I think if Clement the 8. vvere vvell informed hovv all matters doe goe, and in vvhat ſorte he vvas deceived, he vvould anſvvere vvith his predeceſſors: that it vvas not his intention to derogat the Iuriſdiction of the Prieſtes, by taking from them the election of their Superior, vvhich vvas due to them by the Eccleſiaſticall lawes. By this you ſee, that vvhat ſoeuer the Protector vvrott, you vveare to haue an eye to his Holl. intention that commanded him, as your bretherne hadd. Certz for this your facte of admitting the Archprieſt. vpon the Card. letters vvithout Bull. or breve from his holl. you rather deſerue to be called Blinde, then th'others for their lavvfull reſiſting him diſcontented bretherne. This vvich I haue ſaid may ſuffice for this preſent to aduertiſe you that the Card. Protector vvas not to be beleeued in the preiudice of all you Prieſtes in Ingland both diſcontent and vnited vvithout letters from his Holl. nor his Archp. to be by you receiued and by conſequence your diſ-

contented bretherne to haue had iuſt cauſe, of diſcontentment for ſuch vnlavvfull intruſion, and to haue duly and lavvfully refuſed to accept and acknowledg the Archprieſt to be their Superior, before he shewed them the Popes Bulls for his warrant.

The ſecond Queſtion is.

C.1.ext. de trãſl. epiſt.

Whither not only a nevv and extraordinary dignitie as this is, (touching the larg Iuriſdiction ouer 2. Realmes) but if any ordinarye Dignitie or benefice vvhatſoeuer, can be inſtituted and conſtituted by other meanes, then by the Popes expreſſe Bulles or letters?

The negatiue is ſo euident and apparant true, that no inſtance can be giuen againſt it. Beſids that, the Pope affirmeth it him ſelf. Search I pray you all the court rooles in his Holl. chancerie, turne ouer all the bookes and records that are in the office of the Datarie, if you find any one Preſident (ſince the Popes begane to inſtitute and geive benefices) that a Card. Protector vpon his bare letters (with this clauſe in them: *By the expreſſe commandement of his Holl.*) vvithout the Popes Bulls ioyned to them, ever gaue the leaſt benefice of the Popes gifte, then call me Cutt.

Mary, if you can shew me that a Protector hath Without bulls by the expresse commãdment of his Holl. instituted a new dignitie Which was neuer in Ingland or in the church of Christ before, then Will I burne my lawe bookes and quitt that profession, for it is against expresse lawe, against custome, and against the style of the court of Rome. Be not offended if I terme it a new dignitie, neuer hard of before in Christes churche since Christes Assension. I meane for the amplenes and extention of his iurisdiction. For, an Archpr. to haue as great and ample yea greater, iurisdiction ouer all the priestes of 2, realmes, as had all the Bishoppes of those realmes when they weare Cathol. is new and extraordinary. It is a mockery that you call it *an ancient dignitie in Christes churche*. who knoweth it not The question is not of the ancientnes of the dignitie, but of this new and neuer before heard of iurisdiction and auctoritie. It is an ancient dignitie in Christes church you say. I confesse, but with all I saie, it is the loweste & baseste dignitie in Christes church. It is such a one as followeth. His iurisdiction did not further extend then the churche. his office is to gouerne the Quire, to see that the seruice be decently said, and in the Bishops absence he must sing masse vpon holie and festiuall daies. It is his office to begine the seruice, or to appoint a nother to begine it. To his offi-

C. beneficium de regu. iur. in 6

Archp. dignitie is newv, and neuer hard before

Fol. 99.

The ordinary dignitie of an Archp. is the lovveest and baseest in gods Church. Tot. tit. ext. de offic. Archipres.

VVhat is the ordinary officie of an Archpr.

ce it appartaineth to ſee that ſick parſons dye not vvithout confeſſion and receiuing the bleſſed Sacrament. This vvhich I ſay I ſpeake not in contempt of the man or his office, but to giue you to vnderſtād, wherfore your diſcontented bretherne call it a new, extraordinary, and neuer heard of dignitie in Gods churche viz: for this ample auctoritye: and with all to aduertiſe you, that you doe very fondly and childishlie controle your diſcontented bretherne very often in your booke, for termyng the dignitie thus. Your owne conſcience nov will accuſe you, either of ignorance, if you knew not before that an Archp. auctoritie extended no further then the church dore: or of ſplen, (if you knew it) for ſo often tvitting, vpbraidinge and cheaking your bretherne for ſaying a truthe, which you your ſelues knew ſo to be. Which dealinghs of yours throughout your whole booke, maketh your reader to ſee and beleve, that you haue greater deſier by ſuch taunts and toies to diſcredit your bretherne, then to looke into the truth of the matter & controuerſie in queſtion: vvhich (as I haue ſaid) you fled from as from a toade. This is the ſpirit of contention my bretherne and not of charitie. I ſay then, that the firſt inſtitution of the Archp. without bull or ibreue from his Hol: is *mirabile in oculis noſtris*. vnto vs Lawiers, and ſo exhorbitant a caſe in lawe,

Uncharitable dealing.

as the like vvas neuer heard of before. I pray you giue me ſome inſtance for my learning. For hitherto I haue learned and doe teache daily the contrary viz: that none but the Pope and that by his bulls can inſtitute or erect a new dignitie or office in Gods churche. I haue learned that Innocentius the 3. a profoud lavier and diuine did reprehend a Card. Legate for meadling in ſuch things as belonged to his Holl. charge. *Licet in regno Siciliæ generalis ſit tibi commiſſa legatio, ad ea tamen ſine ſpeciali mandato noſtro non debuiſti manus extendere, quæ in ſignum priuilegii ſingularis ſunt tantum Summo Pontifici reſeruata &c.* Allthoughe we haue made the our generall Legate in the kingdome of Sicill, thov oughteſt not for all that to meddle with ſuch things as are reſerued ōly to the highe Bishop in ſigne of his ſinguler priuileage, without our ſpeciall commandment. If you ſay this maketh not againſt the Protector, bicauſe he had the Popes ſpeciall commandement to inſtitute an Archprieſte? You ſay that vhich is in queſtion. For I ſay he had not, neither am I to belewe him ſaying ſo, as before is ſufficiently proued. Then I ſay more, that the Pope in the place alleaged doth vnderſtand of his ſpeciall commandement in writting, bicauſe a Cardinal is not to be beleiued on his worde without letters and writting. I meddle not here with the Popes ſuperame power, I

C. 1. ext. ne ſede vacante: &c

C. quod trãſla. ext. de offic. legati.

know he may doe great things, *ex plenitudine potestatis*, by the plenitude of power ſpecially in matters of beneſices (ſuch is this) for he is *Dominus beneficiorum*, the lord and M. of beneſices, and may at his pleaſure diſpoſe of them: nor of his right of preuention, for he may by collation preuent all election and electors. But I ſpeake of his ordinarie iuriſdiction, by which he giueth and conferreth benefice and dignities. And therfore I ſay, that a Card. Protector can not by his letters conteyning the expreſſe commandement of his Holl. conferre or geue the pooreſt benefice in Ingland that were at the Popes diſpoſition For not vvithſtanding ſuch letters, the benefice ſtood ſtill vacant and as vacant, might be asked ād obteined ouer his hedd, that ſhould take poſſeſſion thereof vppon ſuch letters. If this be true, let the Archp. conſider how iuſtly, he poſſeſſed that dignitie, till the Popes bull cam ſo confirme him. And let him further cōſider, vvhither ſuch a dignitie could be iuſtly obteined vvithout the Popes bulls, and vvaigh that vvhiche Bonifac. 8. decreed:

C. 2. de præbēd. in 6.

C. 19. 1. de præbend. in 6.

vve doe (ſaith he) *ordaine by the ſame auctoritie, that neither Churches* (he meaneth biſ-
" hopricks) dignities, Parſonages or other be-
" neſices that ſhall happe heareafter to be va-
" cant in the Cour of Rome be not conferred,
" but hy his Hollines only, and that no man of
" vvhat auctoritie ſoeuer he be vvhither he ha-
"

ue ordinary right to conferre benefices, or vvhiter he haue generall or ſpeciall leaue to conferre and giue benefices vacant (except he haue ſpeciall and expreſſe commandment giuen him by his holines to conferre thoſe that be vacãt in the court of Rome) doe preſume to conferre them. If a vacant benefice that vvas extant before cannot be giuen by any but by the Pope him ſelf, much leſſe a nevv dignitie or benefice can be inſtitutad by any but by the Pope only, and by his Bulls. To conclude this queſtion the extrauagant iniũctæ alleaged by your bretherne (but by you not anſvvered) doth euidently proue that none ought to take any dignitie or Eccleſiaſticall adminiſtration vpon him, *abſque dictæ ſedis litteris*, vvithout the letters of the Sea of Rome. vvhich extrauagant iniunctæ If Father Liſter had read, he vvould neuer haue anſvvered ſo vnlernedly to his ovvne obiectiõ. *At* (ſaith he) *Bullam nullam aut breue Pontifex confecit*. The Pope hath ſent no bull or or breue to inſtitute him. His anſvvere is *ineptiſſime*, moſt foolishly ſpoken, and vvhy ſo good Father. *Quis enim ſacrorum canonũ hoc vnquam præcipit*. What one of the holy canons hath euer commanded it? I vvonder ſo learned a man to be ſo blind and ouer shot: but a greater vvonder it is to me, to ſee hovve the English ayre hath chaunged his old ſvveete and good nature (for the vvhich eſ-

Pag. 6. C. Iniunctæ Pa. præſenti. in ext. communibus de electione.

Father Liſter ouer ſeene.

pecially he vvas honored and reuerenced of all that knevv him) as is ſeameth by his booke. Well my good olde frende and Father

Pag. 60. I doe novv aduertiſe you of the Canon *Iniunctae* alleaged alſo by the diſcontented bretherne.

Fol. 119. b. Obiection. Novv vvhere you obiect that they might haue ſent to Rome, and haue enquired of the Pope or his Nephevv vvhither that Card. did it not by his hol. expreſſe commandment, or

Anſvveare. no? I anſvveare they vveare not bound in cõſcience to doe it, much leſſe by lavve, bicauſe by this extrauagant by them alleaged they vvere aſſured of their doing, being by it expreſſely forbidden to receiue any Superior vvithout the Popes letters.

The 3. queſtion. The third queſtion, vvhither thoſe vpon vvhom a ſuperior is thruſt in ſuch ſort ought not in lavve and conſcience to vvithſtãd him and not to receiue him?

This queſtion is briefely decided in the foreſaid extrauagant *Iniuncta*. Wheare it is ſaid: *Nullique eos abſque dictarum literarum oſtentione recipiant aut eis pareant*. And that none doe receiue them or obey vnto them, except they shevve the foreſaid letters or bulls. See you not hovv vniuſtly you accuſe your bretherne throughout this book for not obeying their ſuperiors. You meane the Prote. ãd the Archpriſt. You accuſe the Pope and uot them, vvho forbiddeth thẽ by expreſſe vvord

not to obey any that commeth vvithout the Popes bulls, as did both the Protector and the Archprieſt.

The fourth queſtion vvhither he that entreth into a benefice or dignitie (as the Arch. did) be not an intruded parſon, that is, an vniuſt poſſeſſor of that benefice or dignitie? *The 4. queſtiõ.*

Panormitanus is of the opinion that ſuch a one is intruded. *Intruſus appellatur qui obtinet dignitatem ab eo qui non habuit poteſtatem illam conferendi.* He is an intruded parſon vvhich hath obteined a dignitie of him that had no auctoritie to conferre or giue it. But the Protector (as hath bene proued) had no auctoritie to make M. Blackvvell an Archp. Ergo M. Blackvvell taking that dignitie of him, vvas an vniuſt poſſeſſor, till the Popes bulls came, and by conſequent, the Prieſtes had reaſon to vvithſtand him, and not to acknovvledg him for their Superior. You knovv hovv the holy ſcripture termeth ſuch as come in at the vvindovve and not in at the dore, that is, by lavvfull, vſuall and ordinarie meanes. If you aske me rhen, vvhither all that vvhich M. Blackvvell did vntill the Popes bulls cams, vveare fruſtrat and voide, as his excommunications, ſuſpentions, interdicts, taking avvay, or giuen faculties, &c. *Auc. 2. extr. de reſtit. in integr. N. 4.* *M. Blackvvell vvas an intruded parſon till the Breue cam.* *Joan. 10.* *And all he did vvas of no force till the breue cam.*

The ſame Panormitanus anſvvereth thus: knovv thovv, that all that the intruded doth to be of no force howſoeuer or of vvhõ ſoe- *Loco citato.* "

„ ver he be tollerated, obeied, or vpheld in
„ that dignitie: bicauſe tolleration hath no ef-
„ fect in one that is intruded, the reaſon is: bi-
„ cauſe he had not his entrie by one that had
„ auctoritie to put him in that place or roome,

Replie. If you vnited bretherne reply and ſay, that your receiving of him, obeyng and bearing reuerence to him as to your ſuperior, is ſufficient to inſtall and confirme him in that auctoritie: the ſame Panormitanus anſvveareth

Anſvveare. *Sed tu dic quod reuerentia exhibita intruſo non facit illum Prælatum.* But ſay thovv, that the honor and reuerence that is borne or giuen to an intruded parſon, dooth not make him a

Can. 1. diſt. 62. Prelate. And the Pope Leo ſpeaking of intruded parſons hath theiſe vvords. *Quis ambigat nequaquam iſtis eſſe tribuendum, quod nec docetur eſſe collatum?* Who doubteth (quoth he) that is not at all to be attributed to thoſe (intruded) vvhich is not taught or proued to be conferred or giuen vnto them? vpon vvhich vvords the Interpretors gather that an intruded Bishopp is no Bishoppe: neither hath he the executiō of his Bishoprick,

Can. Si per. 63. diſt. office and dignitie. And Pope Nicholas the firſt. *Recipi nullatenus meretur, quem indebitè ordinatum cognoſcunt.* He doth in no vviſe deſerue to be receiued, vvhom men knovve to haue ben vnduly ordeined or conſtituted. By all vvhich is refuted that vvhich Fa. Liſter puttheth dovvne § 6. D. 3. for allbeit the

Arc.

Archp. had bene receued and admitted, by the greater, better and learnerdet part: yet you ſee by Panormitanus their admiſſion maketh him not a Prelate, bycauſe he was not lawfully inſtituted. Let all ſuch of your vnited crewe as receued faculties of M. Blackwell to heare confeſſiõs before the Bulles came, looke to them ſelues, whither they had auctoritie to abſolue or no? *Quia nemo plus iuris ad alium transferre poteſt quam ipſe habet.* Maiſter Blackwell had no auctoritie then to giue faculties, as you ſee: ergo you that receiued them of him had none at all. Further more, the vnlawfull and vniuſt entrance of M. Blackwell is proued thus. *Beneficium Eccleſiaſticum non poteſt licite ſine inſtitutione canonica obtineri.* An Eccleſiaſticall benefice (as the Archpriſt is) cannot be laufully obteined or gotten without canonicall inſtitution. But M. Blackwell obtained not his benefice by canonicall inſtitution. Ergo he cam not in by the dore, but by the windowe. I proue the Minor thus. Dinus the beſt and learneſt Interpretor on the rules of the Canon lawe, ſaieth the rule intendeth to ſay thus much. That if any be inſtituted by him who hath no right to inſtitute, or if the forme be not obſerued that ought to be obſerued in inſtitutions, that then the Inſtitution is not canonicall, bicauſe it wanteth that which is of the ſubſtance of the Inſtitution: and therfore by ſuch

Note.

L. Nemo ff. de regul. iuris.

his intruſion further proued.

C. beneficium de reg. iur. in 6.

an Inſtitution a benefice cannot be lawfully obteyned. But M. Blackwell was inſtituted by him that had no right to inſtitute as hath bin proued ſufficiently: ergo he gote that benefice vnlawfully, and by conſequent was lawfully reſiſted by the diſcontentsd brethene and vniuſtly admitted by your vnited bretherne. Beſide this, Nauarr teacheth that Iulius 3. by his decree did ſo explicat and extēd the chapter *Iniunctæ*, that if any one had obteined the Popes ſignature for a benefice, and vpon that ſignature ſhould take poſſeſſion before he had his bulles, that he ſhould looſe that benefice for the ſame and be made vncapable therof. Now M. Blackwell tooke poſſeſſion without either ſignature or bull and therfore was made vncapable of that dignitie. If you anſwere that this dignitie of Archprieſt is not rekened vp amongſt the dignities that are rekened in that chapt. *Iniunctæ*, and ſo the extenſion made by Iulius 3. not to apperteine to him? The ſame Nauarr anſwereth that Iulius 3. doth not only meane of theſe Prelates named in the ſaide chapter, but alſo of all ſuch as be put in their place, or are equall to them. But the Archp. is put in the place not of one, but of many bishopps, and is equall to them in Iuriſdiction: ergo the chapt. *Iniunctæ*, is extended to him by the rule: *Surrogatum ſapit naturam eius in cuius locum ſurrogatur*. And by conſequence Maiſt.

In comment. de ſpoliis clericorū pa. 7. no. 3.

Ad c. accepta extr. de reſtitut. ſpoliat. oppoſ. 8. N. 24. o.

Pa. licet inſtit, de teſtatis.

Blackvv. was intruded taking the poſſeſſion without bull or breue of his hollines.

The fifthe queſtion, Whither thoſe prieſts that receiued the Archp. as their Superior vpon the Card. letters without the Popes bulles, did not offend, and are punishable for it? *The 5. queſtion.*

This queſtion is decided in fewe wordes by Bonifacius the 8. in the forenamed extrauagant *Iniunctæ*, alleaged by your bretherne for their defence, but by you drowned in the depth of ſilence. A ſigne you writt not with a mynde to ſearch out the truth, but With intention to brable, and to continewe ſtrief ād contention concealing and omitting the ſtreingth and proof of your aduerſarie, ād rūve aroving after by matters and childish toies nothing at all apparteynig to the matter in queſtion. All chapters of churches (ſaith he) and all couentes of religious howſes, or any other whoſoeuer that ſhall receiue or obey any of the aboue named, except they bring with them his holl. bulls, ſhalbe ſo longe ſuſpēded from receiving the fruit of their benefices, till they haue deſerued to obtaine againe the grace and fauor of the Sea Apoſtolick. You perceiue by this thē if you had had benefices, for your willing or rather light admitting of the Archprieſter in the order you did, you had loſt all the commodities of them, till his Holl: had forgiuen you that offence. I and albeit you haue eſcaped the pu-

" " " " " " "

D. C. Iniunctæ pa. capitata. The vnited prieſts punishable for receauing the Archp. vpon the Card. letters.

nishment, yet can you not but see, and confesse, that you did not well, but directly against the Popes institution, (*Nam qui ab huius sedis Rectoribus plena auctoritate sancitur, &c. firmiter & inconcusse teneatur*. For that which is ordeined by full auctori. of the gouerners of this Sea, and ought firmly and stably to be keapt) to receiue any Prelat whosoeuer or by vvhat meanes or order soeuer he vvas sent you. Yf he came not vvith his Holl: letters, beside the canon *Nulli fas est distinct.* 19. alleaged to no purpose by Father Lister in the 5.§ of his booke doth flatlye condemne you, saying that it is not lavvfull for any man in will or dead to transgresse the commandement of the Sea Apostolick &c. but you by receiuing the Archp. vvithout the Popes bulles did transgresse the commandements of Bonifacius the 8. Ergo you transgressed the commandement of the Sea Apostolick: and by consequent fell into the penalties by Gregory the 4. sett dovvne in the foresaid Canon. Look to it. Thus then you see your selues to be charged vvith ouermuch lightnes, and your bretherne to be discharged of disobediēce schisme and sinne ād all. Nor can you excuse your selues by saying you knevv not thus much before, bicause *Ignorantia iuris neminem excusat.*, to be ignorant of the lavves, is no iust excuse or to be admitted. According to these promisses

Can. consequens dist. 11.

C. Ignorantia de regu. iur. in 6

your diſcontented brethern if they ſay it, (for you note not the page) doe full well and truly ſay, that which you impute to thē, viz *falſe informacion*, (why? was not his hollines enformed only by 2. Ieſuite and a ſecular prieſte, that ſpake againſt his knowledge) *not hard of in the Church before* (this I haue proued to be true) and that *it is againſt all equitie and iuſtice* (This y haue ſufficiently proued alſo) and that *his holl. could not lavvfully appoint it vvithout their conſentes*, which is full true meaning by the ordinarie maner of proceading, according to the Canons and Decrees of his predeceſſors) and *that the meanes by vvhic he appointed it is inſufficient*, (as done by a Card. letters vvithout the Popes bulls, which is as hath bene proued inſufficient to erect a new dignitie) *binding no man to obey it*, (bicauſe it was doon againſt the canons, decrees, and cōſtitutiōs of the church and contrarie to the cuſtome and ſtile of the court of Rome. As lik wiſe that is true they ſay. *A nevv and extraordinary authoritie*, &c. Which you very abſurdly haue put downe as abſurdly ſpoken, as in place will beſhewed.

The laſt queſtion, Whither rhat thoſe prieſts that withſtand a ſuperior put vpon them in order a forſaid, be ſchiſmaticks or whether they do ſinne atall for thus withſtandige him? To begine vvith the laſt, ſure it is they ſined

Fol. 14. *The 6. and laſt queſtion.*

The prieſt did not ſine innot receiuing the Archp.
L. iuſtè ff. de acq. poſſeſt.

not at all. For vvhoſoeuer doth that vvhich the lawe or their Superiot cõmãd thẽ to doe, doth not ſine at all. But theiſe prieſts did nothing but that Which the lawe ãd their Superior the Pope commanded them to doe, as hath bene proued out of the extrauagant *Iniuncta*, Ergo they did not ſinne in refuſinge, to obey the Archp. inſtituted by a Cardinals letters.

The chief cauſe of all this controuerſie.

This queſtion of Schiſme is the chiefeſt cauſe of this controuerſie, not only for that they weare counted, yea forſooth by a ſcandalous and vnlearned booke proued to be ſchiſmaticks, ãd that by the approbation of the Prouinciall ſuperior of the Ieſuits, ãd the Archprieſt, for that they did not receiue the Archp. vpon the Card. letters: but allſo for that vpon the ſight of the bull they did not, acknowledge them ſelues ſchiſmaticks, and make recantation thereof, or els not to be admitted to confeſſion and abſolution. Oh follie! o ignorance! o ſcandall! o wante of charitie! how is it poſſible that men who ſtill proteſted to be obediẽt childrẽ to the Sea Apoſtolick and weare in priſon (ſome of thẽ) many yeres for the defence of the Sea Apoſtolik that promiſed all obedience vpõ the ſight of his hol. bulles, could be ſchiſmaticks? Schiſma (ſaieth Pope Pelagieus) *Sciſſuram ſonat*, Schiſme ſoundeth or ſignifieth a cutting of. But theiſe mẽ did not cutt them ſelues of, nor

VVhether the prieſts that refuſed to receaue the Archp. vpon the Card. letters vvere ſchiſmaticks or no.
They cold not poſsible be ſchiſmaticks.

C. Schiſma 24. q. 1.
VVhat is ſchiſme.

from the *Sea Apoſtolick* ergo no ſchiſmatickes. Againe *in vnitate* (ſaieth he) *ſciſſura eſſe non poteſt.* In vnitie can be no cutting of. Theſe men remaineing ſtill in vnitie vvith the ſea Apoſtolick how could they be cutt of? The ſame Pope ſaieth elſwhere. *Quiſquis ergo ab Apoſtolicis diuiſus eſt ſedibus, in ſchiſmate eum eſſe non dubium eſt.* Who ſoeuer is then deuided from the Apoſtolicall Sea it is not to be doubted, but that he is in ſchiſme. *A contrario ſenſu.* he then that is not deuided frō the Apoſtolick Sea, is not in ſchiſme. Your bretherne weare not deuided from that Sea, ergo they were not in ſchiſme. you know how greuous paines and penalties are adioyned vnto it. how great thē was the fault of hī that made the booke of ſchiſme to proue thoſe that cōmunicated with the ſea of rome to be ſchiſmaticks? how great was their fault that by their auctoritie and ſubſcriptions auctorized that booke? a folish book in deed grownded not vpon a rocke, but vpon the ſand. For, for his foundation he put that for a certaintie which was and is in queſtion viz: that the Cardin. letters wherin was made mention of the Popes expreſſe commandement, weare ſufficient to inſtitute this dignitie. he erred in the lawe, and therfore gaue vs ſuch poore diuinitie. But let vs ſuppoſe that the Card. had the Popes letters, to ſhewe in confirmation of his auctoritie, (as he had not) and that the

Can. non vero quiſquis 23. q. 5.

For Fa. Liſter hath tould you in his § 6.

prieſtes, not Withſtanding, that did reſiſt him yet in this caſe it was neither ſchiſme nor rebellion: bicauſe they might alleage the Popes letters were gotten by ſurreption and falſe information. Ar all ſuch as impugne the Popes bulles and breues vpon theſe 2. occaſions, or any other iuſt occaſion (which are daily impugned in Rome it ſelf) accompted ſchiſmatiks, rebellious factious or ſeditious? or contemners of their Superiors for the ſame? nothing leſſe. But of this matter which is the chief hedd and cauſe of this contention, (as your diſcontēted bretherne do shewe to his hol. and the Inquiſition) You ſay: You *vvill not talke of, and that you are very ſorye that euer it vvas mētioned.* or brought in queſtion, and why? *bicauſe vnquiet people hath taken occaſion therby to continue contention, and to make more brables then vve are neadfull.* Thank thoſe vnquiet heds that would be meadlinghe in other mens matters. Thanke thoſe thar auctorized it, and be not offended with thoſe vvhom you call vnquiet people, for defending the truth yea for defending their honor good name and fame, for cōplainninge of the iniurie doon vnto thē by ſo ſclāderous and ſcandalous a booke. you cry out on them, you hunt and chaſe them throughout your boke for hauing touched the name fame, and honor of ſomme particuler men

for leſſer faults (I do not find fault when you tell them their faults in deed) and yet you are offended vvith them, for defending them ſelues from the blame of ſo horrible a crime as ſchiſme is, vvhich I diſlik in you. If to shew the great ſtrief and diſlick you haue conceaved againſt Do. Nordone for calling one *graue Prieſt a knight ſonne, arrant knaue*, not openly *but in his eare* and at another time *knave and Montebanck in the preſence of* 2. *Prieſts*. (You do not ſpare his ashes, but by this compt, do all that in you is, to deface a dead mans memorie): how great cauſe then haue ſo many graue Prieſtes yet liuing to be offended. Firſt with Fa. Liſter vvith writing then vvith the Prouinciall, Archprieſt, and you vnited brethern for callumniating them not in corners and in mens eares, but openly not before 2. Prieſts only, but before the wholle vvorld publickly, not for writting or callinge *them knaues or Montebancks* but to be infinitly vvorſer, baſer, and more abiect in all Chriſtien mens eares, then *arrant knaves or Montebancks* can be, for no Chriſtian man can be more iniured and infamed. then to be called accompted and as it weare proued Schiſmaticks, yea vvorſer then ſouthſaiers, wiches and Idolaters? If you in reaſon may miſlik vvith Do. Nordon for the one, farre greater reaſon haue they to miſlike with theiſe termes, names and shamefull reproches. Was it

Fol. 81. *b.*

not highe time for them to look about them, and to defend their honor estimation, good name, fame and renowne? But *you will not talke at all of this schisme*: Why so? for they weare either iustly or iniustly accused therof. If iustly: What cause haue you to hold your peace and to *be sorry that it vvas mentioned*? seing you lay so at them, vvith hands and heales for farre smaller matters. Example, For not putting the name of the printer, nor the place where it vvas printed, vvith such other trifles. Very lick it is, if you could iustly haue accused them of schisme, you wold not haue spared them. If they vveare accused vniustly (as they vveare by your owne confession, and as his Holl. since by a Breve hath declared, by condemning that slandarous booke that vvas vvritten against them) with what face and cõscience can you extoll aboue the skies these persones that were the writters and approvers of that booke, wherin they vvere condemned for schismaticks, yea to be seditious and worse then soothsaiers and Idolators. And why? for sooth, for obeying, and keapinge the decrees and Canons of the churche, in not admitting an Archpriest constituted and sett ouer them without his Holl. Bulles.

The second point in controuersie is for renevving the crime of schisme after his Holl. breue vvas come.

This accusation of schisme so haynous a crime, is the chief point also of controuersie betwene your discontented bretherne and the Iesuits and Archpriest ioyned vvith them

in affection and error. The vvich being forgotten aud forgiuen on both parts after the commyng of his Holl. Bulles, and the vnion made: the Archprieſt begane againe to ſett a broach the vnſauory licor of ſchiſme, calling and holding them for ſchiſmaticks, bicauſe they denied him obedience vppon the Card. letters. This is the occaſion of writting their bookes in their defence, this is the cauſe of their complaining to his Holl. and this was alſo the chief cauſe of their appeale from the Archprieſt. The 2. chief points you touch not, neither come you neare to them in your Apologie: But fill vp your booke with *old diſſentiones and practiſes againſt D. Alleine* with *impertinent letters*, vvith *Fishers examinations*, with *praiſes of perticuler men*, vvith *diſgraces of your ovvne coate and profeſſion*, and to be brief with words talke, tatle, and babbell, all quite from the purpoſe, and nothing to the controuerſie in queſtion.

The cauſe vvhy the Prieſts vvrot in Latine and Englishe.

The vnited neuer come neare the point in controuerſie.

To omitt that the Ieſuits had not to doe or medle in theis points and contention betwene the Archprieſt and the Prieſts: I ſay, it apperteined to their coat and profeſſion rather to haue vſed all charitable meanes to haue vnited them together, then to haue vſed ſuch ſtrang meanes to diſloyne and ſeperat them more then before by exaſperating the Prieſts one againſt another. I know the ſocietie vvas at firſt founded and grovvnded vpon

The fault of our English Ieſuits at home.

loue and charitie towards his neighbor, vpon teaching and making concorde and vnitie: But alas? some in this point doe stagger and haue fare swarued from the first foundation, and seame to begine to build and vvorke vpō other mens discordes and dissentions, the vvhich as I feare me in the end will work discredit on both sids, so am I sure in the meane time it is the cause of the losse of many a Soule. God amend all that is amisse and geue you grace either to absteine frō setting out your larger Apologie, or els to sett it out with better stuff then is in this your first, vvith more truth in handlinge of matters, vvith more charitie to vvards your discontēted brethern and vvith more respect to your owne order and vocation, vvhither the Author be an vnited Priest or a Religious Parson.

Fol.9. Of time appealing.

Theare you talk of appeales, as thoughe they did Iniurie to the Archpriest to appeale from him. The Iudge *a quo* from vvhom a mā appealeth, is neuer iniured by appealing frō him. Bicause by appealiug a man is constrained to doe it, rather in his owne defence then to dishonor or iniure the Iudge. But *they appealed for others aswell as for them selues.* Neither is this so absurde as you vvould make men beleave. for as in some cases, if one gaine the victory by appellation, it doth help all his companions, so lickvvise one may appeale for an other or in the name of a nother. *Si sit*

eadem causa defensionis, if it be the same cause of defence. As our Interpretors note, and so it apperteineth not to sedition, as you say, but to defension. But none hath as yet *appeared in Rome to present the appeale*. Good cause vvhy. their bretherne were so vvell handled there vvith their appeale. It is periculosum for thē to come theare, and therfore are excusable. Besids *de iure comuni* the appellāt hath a whole yere to prosecute his appeale, and if he hath lette that yere, for that cause, the second yere is granted him to persue his appeale. and if he be so lett, that he cannot the second yere persue it, for a iust cause and lett the third yere may be graunted to him to persue his appeale. And what iuster cause of lett can theare be to your brethern, then the might of their aduersaries at Rome, their imprisonment at home, and their vvant of money and meanes to goe or send to Rome? And as for M. Charmocks appeale made in Lorraine it vvas lawfull and to be admitted, as he well proveth in his letter to Card. Burgesius and Nauar. saith. *Hoc verum enim, &c.* This is true (*that a man cannot appeale* from the excommunication after he is excōmunicated) vvhen the excōmunicatiō is pure and not condicionall: But whē it is vnder condition, except you do this or that, (viz you are excommicated) then it is otherwise. for a man may appeale from a conditionall excommication, yea after the 10.

C. Penult. ext. de appellat. & 161. D. D.

Argument. c. ex parte 1. de appellat. Auth. Siqui c. de temp. appellat. & clem. sicut de appell. c. ex ratione ext. de appell.

M. Charnokes appeale vvas lavvfull.

Pag. 91.

Ad c. cum contingat de rescript. 14. cum nullitatis. no. 7.

"
"
"
"

„ Daies (allowed to appeale in) before the con-
„ dition fall out. Which is M. Charnoks caſe,
vvho vvas vvilled not to goe into Ingland
without leave vnder the paine of excommu-
nication. Before the condition fill out, that is,
before hewent into Ingland, he appealed frō
that ſentence, and that iuſtly, as you ſee out
of Nauarr. You obiect as a great fault, That
*in the meane ſpace no obedience or regard is had to
the Superior During the dependance of the appeale.*
Why? are you ignorant of this that appella-
tion doth ligare manus Iudicis a quo? bind the
Iudgs hands from whom one appealeth. that
is, that all Iuriſdiction is taken from that Iud-
ge in the matters wherin it is appealled from
him. But their appeale is in generall and in all
matters from the Archprieſt ergo in no mat-
ter hath he iuriſdiction ouer them. Maryif
they appeale but in ſome matters only, and
diſobey him in the reſt, they offend hey nouſ-
lye by that diſobedience. And as for the ap-
peale it ſelf (if all be true they lay dovvne
theare, as I deame it to be, bicauſe you do not
cōtrovle or refute any part theroof) I thinck
neuer men had iuſter cauſe to appeale then
they had. Reade then who liſt, and if he haue
any iudgment he vvill confeſſe as much. As
you accuſe them here very vniuſtly for ap-
pealing. ſo they do full iuſtly (bicauſe you do
not correct nor cheeck them for it) complai-
ne of the Archprieſt iniquitie, for ſuſpending,

Fol. 9. b. C. Romana Pa. cum vero de appella. in 6.

Pag. 54. 70.

interdicting them and taking away their faculties, after their appellation, and after that his hands were bound. The lettre with which he suspended them is sett dovvne verbatim in their booke to the Inquisitors. I thincke he is not so ignorant as not to knovve, that *nihil debet innouari a iudice a quo, post appellationẽ.* If he knew not so much, yet for the respect and reuerence he ought to haue borne to his Holl. to whom they appealled, he should haue abstained from those rigorous and seuere actions. If I had bene one of them, I beleave I should haue said. accordinge to the Proverbe. Hold your hand M. Blakvv. for god sendeth a shrevvde covve short hornes. You push at vs vvith the hornes of your suspensions and interdicts, but you hurt vs not, as he did not hurt thã indeed, and therfore they did lavvfully and iustly exercise all the functions of Priesthood notwith standing those censures *quia latæ fuerunt a non suo iudice* they having taken all iurisdiction frõ him by their appeale. Besids M. Blackw. is punishable by lawe, bicause he did not, admitt their appeale. by this and diuers other of his actions, men may see how vnfitt diuines be to gouerne the church, vvithout the aid of Canonistes.

Pag. 53. The Archpriest doth against lavve.

C. De priore ext. de appell. l. quoniam iudices c. eod.

The 8. fault is, for finding fault vvith thẽ for printing their bookes vvithout *perticular name of Author, vvithout licence of Superior and other circumstances of modestie, &c.* When you

The 8. fault. Fol. 9. b.

your ſelues doe committ the ſame fault. what perticular name of Author hath this your Apol. forſooth, *The vnited Prieſts*. and theirs hath *By Prieſts that vveare accuſed of Schiſme*. You ſay: *Permiſſu ſuperiorum*, by the permiſſion of our Superior. And they ſay: *Printed at Roan by Jacob Molens.* they name the place and printer, and you putt neither place nor printer in yours. For their want of modeſtie, courſe them hardly, I do not find fault therewith, ſo that you your ſelues had not fell into the ſame fault. for in many places you paſſe alſo the bands of modeſtie. Remembre who ſaith. *Turpe eiſim Doctori, &c.* In this leafe and the next you lay load on them, vvhether iuſtly or no, I vvill not iudge, but doe leave it to their owne defence. If they haue deſerved it, I am full gladd they are tould of it ſo rovvndly, to teach them and others that vvrit heareafter to be more modeſt, and to keape thē ſelues vvith in the compaſſe of their matter.

In the ſame leafe it is a vvorld to ſee, hovv you lay a bout you to perſuade the Readers, that for the cauſes by you theare alleaged, your bretherne fell againe to contention (after the receipt of the Bull) againſt the Archprieſt. But they tell another tale, ād put downe other cauſes of their contention, vvhich, as it vvas the chiefeſt moriue of their appeale and of their vvritting to his holl. you haue quietly omitted theare vvith ſilence. Thus they

The cauſe of the laſt contention ſince the Bull. came.

Pag. 61.

they say in effect to his Holl. *As soone as they savve his Bull, they submitted them selues to the Archpriest and being desirous of peace, they forgate and forgaue all iniuries passed and specially by vvhich they vvere proclaimed through out Ingland for Schismaticks, by a booke vvritten against them.* Then in the next page, they tell their tale thus. *Not long after the common ioy, that ensued of this vnitie,* vvhich proceeded of the receipt of his Holl. Bull, *the Archpriest of his ovvne accorde, or sett on* (as they rather thinck) *by the Iesuits, begane againe to renew the ovld vvarre in charging them vvith the ovvld calumnie of schisme, vvritting letters thereof and dispersing the copies abrode euery vvheare* (the letter is put dovvne in the 63. pag. of their latin booke) *vvherin he reporteth he had receaued a resolution from Rome, that all they vvhich did not admitt him for their Superior before the Popes Bull came, vveare Schismaticks and that they should satisfie therfore* (that is: recant their schisme) *before they be absolued of any Priest that vvas not noated vvith the marke of that schisme.* And for proof hereof they sett dowPag. 110.
ne in th'end of their appeale, the forme of abiuring this schisme, that euery Priest that vvithstood him, must make before he be absolued in confession. For theis iniuries they appealed and vvrot to his Holl. to haue his iudgment, whether they vveare schismaticks

The Pope reprehendeth the Archprieſt for his ſeueritie. And quitteth the Prieſtes frō ſchiſme.

for this fact, or no? His Holl. ſince in a Bull of Pacification ſent dovvne before Chriſtmas (the which I ſawe and read) doth not only exhort both ſids to peace and vnitie: But alſo reprehendeth the Archprieſt for his ouer ſeuere and auſtere gouerment, and quitteth your bretherne from the crime of ſchiſme, in condemninge the booke that was written by Fa. Liſter againſt them, and approued by his Prouincial and the Archprieſt.

The ſtate of the queſtion.

This is then the queſtion. Whether the Archprieſt did call and compt them Schiſmaticks after their obedience made to him vpon the comming downe of his Holl. Bull, for not obeying him vpon the Card. Protectors letters? This is the treble, vpon vvhich they plaie, and the vvhich they ſound againſt the Archprieſt. For either this is true, vvhich they ſay, or falſe. If true? (as I haue already proved) they could not be ſchiſmaticks therefore, the Pope affirmeth them to be none, and you your ſelues cōfeſſe ſo much, as being *ſorye that euer mention vvas made thereof*) then doe you writt againſt your owne cōſcience, by writinge againſt a knowne truth, defending a falshood, or diſguiſinge a veritie. If it be falſe, then had it bene your parte to proue it, ād to shevve that the Archprieſt neuer vvrot ſuch a lettre, nor preſcribed ſuch a forme of abiuration as before. If you cannot proue this in your next larger Apologie. then are you bound in cōſciēce and

The vnited are bound to ask the other Prieſtes forgeivennes.

of charitie to aske them forgiuenes, for the iniurie you doe them in this your booke, in making the vvorld beleue vvith words vvithout proof, that they, and not the Archprieſt were the Authors and beginners of theſe troubles and contentions, ſince the receipt of his holl: bulles. Look vvel to your ſelues in this point, leaſt the threats and comminatiõs you mention elſvvhere fall not vpon yout ovvne heads, for concealing ãd adultering the truth and the cauſes of this contention, ãd for putting them vpon other mens shoulders. Is this to deuiſe *nevv Iniuries offred by the vnquiett*, vvhen they are indeed ovvld Iniuries renevved to make and encreaſe diſquietnes and diſſention?

In the tenth leafe, yon applie againe the laſt contention of the Romaine colleage to this quarell novv betvvene the Prieſtes and the Archp. and the Ieſuits: but hovv vnaptly hath ben noated before, ãd euery reader that is not ſtarke blind may eaſly ſee, ãd it is flatt againſt the rule in lavve that ſaieth: *a diuerſis nõ fit illatio*, theare can be made no good illanciõ or conſequenee from things that be diuers or oppoſit. *Impertinens.*

Your 9. fault is in calling Card. Caietaine the Protector your *higher Superior* and againe *Our higheſt Superiour vnder his Hollines* and *from ſo highe a Superior*. vvhich in deed is a fowle ignorant fault in you. Why? is the Protector *The 9. fault. Fol. 12. Fol. 103 104.*

The Protector of Jngland is not ſuperior to any Englisman.

of Ingland, in that he is Protector your Superior? Nay, hath he any auctoritye or Iuriſdiction vpon the pooreſt Englishman that is, either at home in Ingland or in Rome? Dare you be ſo dull as to affirme it? He is called Protector a *protegendo*, that is: he is honored vvith that title, to helpe, aide and aſſiſt the cõtrey, or any of the nation in their ſuits and affaires they haue in the court of Rome. But as for auctoritye or iuriſdiction he hath none ouer any vvhereof he is Protector, as Card. or protector. You are vvillfully blind, and ſo vvould make your Readers alſo in making them beleeue that the Protector of the natiõ is not only a ſuperior but alſo the higheſt Superior our nation hath vnder his Holl. for I tell you, he hath no more auctoritye ouer an Englishman as Protector, then I haue vvhich is none at all. vpon this error or ignorãce Fa. Liſter founded and built his ruinons booke of ſchiſme, vpon theis vvords. *Qui vos ſpernit, &c.* as thoughe they had diſpiſed the Protector their Superior. Novv you ſee hovv the good Fa. was deceaved. In your next Apologie recall this groſſe and palpable error, or shevve vs your reaſons, Why he is our Superior as he is Protector. And hereby is made voide all your ſpeaches, of *gods iudgment. kinge Saules example, diſobedience ſo often iterated, &c.* Bicauſe the Protector vvas not their ſuperior, ãd next he did not proue, neither can

Fol. 12. b.

you prove for him, that he vvas the Popes Delegat to institute an Archprieſt ouer the. *Fiſchers memoriall.*

In the 11. leafe you repeat againe the aſſociation and make mention of Fiſchers memorialls as you doe in many places of your booke, ſtuffing ād farcing the ſame, with one and the ſelf ſame thinge often repeated. But vvhat vvas this Fisher of vvhoſe examination you make ſuch accompt as of a Ievvel? In your ovvne conceit he vvas a levvde Felowe, a Rogge and of no credite, and by your ovvne report *one of the moſt exorbitant diſorderly fellovves in the Romaines ſturres.* And yet forſoothe you vvill haue all the vvorld beleaue his examination. But your Reader muſt vndreſtand, that this miſerable fellovve comming to Rome, after that the ſturres in the colleage vveare happely finished, he vvas caught by the back in Rome by thoſe againſt whom he had written and diſperſed the often named memoriall *vvritten in D. Griffith his houſe in Cambray.* and ſo was putt into the hands of the officers of his Holl. The miſerable fellovve being apprehended and fearing the Gallies or the gallovves, to ſaue his life and limmes, vvas readie to ſvveare and forſvveare, yea and to writt and ſpeake *Placentia.* that is to ſay, ſuch thingb as he knevv vvould beſt pleaſe the offended perſons, and by which he might obteine for him ſelf perdon and libertie. And albeit the Author of this booke counteth

Fol. 7. 13. 26. b. 68. 80. b. 81. 82. 95.

VVhat vvas this Fiſher.

Fol. 93.

Fol. 97.

him a naughtie fellowe, yet would he haue his reader beleeue, that all that he ſpake or vvrott vvas ghoſpell. And vvhy ſo? Mary bi-
Fol.82. cauſe he ſubſcribed his examination: *Ego R. Fish. ita dico, iuro, & ratifico.* I R. Fish. do ſay ſo, ſweare and ratefie. And *bicauſe Fisher depoſed much more*, then you haue laid dovvne here *tactis Euangelijs* putting his hand vpõ the ghoſ-
Fol.97. b. pell. The 3. reaſon vvhy vve ought to be-
Fol.82. leave all vvas true, was bicauſe. *All this is confirmed againe by the ſubſcription of his Holl. officer.* Ego *Acharitius Sqorſionius*, &c. vvhich you *ad for more credit of the matter* forſooth as though the Popes officers do not ſubſcribe to many a lye, that falſe fellowes make in their examination. He did not ſubſcribe to giue more credite to the matter thereby, as you ignorantly ſay, but to giue faith and credit that that vvas it vvhich he depoſed or ſaid in his examination, be it true or falſe.

Fisher vvas pariured by you ovvne Coufeßiö.

But vvhy should I or any other gyue credit to Fishers depoſitions, vvhen your ovvne conſcience make you to tell vs that all he ſpake in a manner vvas but lyes. For thus you
Fol. 95. ſay: *And albeit vvee vvill not affirme all to be true vvhich he ſaid, yet many things are ſuch as could not be vvell feigned, and are confirmed othervvize, and the ſpeaking voluntarilie vpon his oath muſt be preſumed to haue had ſomme care alſo of his conſcience*, &c. vvhy doo you not *beleeue all he ſaid to be true*, but *Many things* ſeeing he ſpake

voluntariely vpon his oath, and *muſt be preſumed, to haue hadd ſomme care alſo of his conſcience?* Yf you beleeue not all he ſaid vpon his voluntarie oath, why should you or your Readers beleeue *Many things* he ſpake and vttered vpon his voluntarie oath, and conſtrayned for feare of his life? I ſee no reaſon vvhy I should not deeme him periured in all he ſayd, and to haue ſaid all againſt his conſcience, to pleaſe them in whoſe hands his life lay, aswell as you Deeme him to haue bene periured in ſome things, and in ſome thinges to haue ſpoken againſt his conſcience. For if you thinck not all to be true he ſaid, vpō his oth? I thinck nothing at all he ſaid vppon his oath to be true, for the reaſones a foreſaid. For *Qui ſemel preſumitur malus, ſemper preſumitur malus in eodem genere mali.* Yf he be periured in ſaying ſome things, he is preſumed to be a periured perſon in all he vttered vpon his oath. Your reader muſt conſiderer Fisher to haue bene one of the chiefeſt Doers in the Romane ſturres againſt the Fathers, and after to haue gone into Inglād there to defame them, then to haue commen into the Lovve conntreis and there to haue vvritten againſt them a ſlanderous libell or memoriall (all this you report in your booke, in the places before quoted) at laſt to haue cōmen againe to Rome (more then half conuerted as you ſay) and there to haue bene apprehended and

Conſider Fisher ſtanding quaking before his iudge.

Fol. 94. b.

purſued by ſuch as he had before defamed ſtanding before the Popes Atturney, quaking and quivering through feare of his life, and then to depoſe or ſay vvhat he knevv vvould pleaſe and like thoſe in vvhoſe hands the thred of his lief lay either to be lenghtned or shortened. Novv coniecture you, if this vveare a voluntarie oath or no. if he had any remorce of conſcience or reſpected what he ſaid ſaue only that vvhich might procure his libertie? Add this, that the Authors of this Apologie doe not beleeue them ſelves, that all was true, vvhich he ſaid vpon his oathe. All theiſe circunſtannces laied together, vvhat haue you gotten by namyng Fisher and his examination ſo often as you doe? Truly with vviſe ād prudēt Readers nothing at all: but it doth reather make againſt you, and ſo you might vvel haue leaft it out.

Fol. 14. *No fault to call the Protectors pouver in queſtion.*

The fault you lay vppon them, for calling *into controuerſie the Protectors actions and pouver* no fault at all, bicauſe he had no auctoritie or power to inſtitute an Archp. nor was he their Superior as hath bene shevved before: but the fault was in the Archp. in accepting of that dignitie in ſuch ſort and yours in conſenting vnto him and taking him for your Superior, vvho vvas then no more your Superior thē the man in the moone. And in that you add, *They bring in contempt vvhat ſo euer hath bene done in Rome hitherto, about the inſtitution and confir-*

nuation of this Hierarchie: You may vvell put *hitherto* and *continuation* in your purses, for it is vvell knovvne both by their confessions and yours that they impugned the institution made by the Card. only and obeid, so soone as they savve the Popes bull. And therfore thit is one of your accustomed figures called a fitton: to bring them vnduly into discredit. And to proue they speake contemptuously you add, they call it *a nevv and extraordinary auctoritie*. Ergo they speak contemptuously. If to speak truth be to speak contemptuously. I grant your conclusion: but if that be neWe and extraordinarie, that neuer was in Christs church before (as this officie with soe large a Iurisdiction, of which they meane, and you your selues knowe it well but that you list to wrangle) full sure it is, that this Archp. office was neuer in Christs church before, and so is it *nevve and extraordinary*, and you haue shewed your vanitie in correcting *Magnificat*. They knewe so well as you that it is an Ancient dignitie in Christs church, and haue read so well as you the title *de Officio Archypresbyteri*, of the Archp. office, but withall they knewe more then you (as it seemeth) that an Archpr. had neuer the same iurisdiction, or greater then all the Bishops of 2. realmes had, when they weare in possession of their Bishopricks. This is in deede a newe and extraordinary dignitie

A fitten.

This Archp. auctoritie is nevv

and neuer in Christs churche before.

Neuer Archpr. had such Jurisdiction.

dignitie, is it not my brethren, what say you? tell ma, (I pray you) in your larger Apolog. what you iudge of it, and why you complaine of your brethren heere for calling it, a newe auctoritie. Mary if they had said or written that his holl. could not giue him so large and ample iurisdiction and auctoritie, then might you haue iustly reprehended the for so fowle an error. But for attributing cõtempt to them for saying truth, and that your conscience doe tell you to be truth, surely you haue committed a fowle fault, and take heede that it proceedeth not of Splen: assured I am that you taske them vniustly for it.

a fovvle fault.

Besides, your fault is in taking your aduersaries words by peece meale onely, as hereticks are accustomed to doe, and leaving out his discourse. Yf you had meant vvell you should haue answvered the foundation and ground of their discourse, the which you passe ouer in silence, bicause in truth you are not able to answere it. I egge you lett vs see vvhat you can doe in your larger Apolog. for this vvas sett out in hast, as it seemeth by the substaunce thereof.

Pag. 9.

Fol. 14. Your brethren

It followveth: *vnpleasing and obtruded auctoritie*. vvhich are bothe true: *vnpleasing* to them to haue an Archp. (the verie inferior dignitie in Gods church) in steade of a Bishopp vvhich they desired. *Obtruded*, by Fath. Par-

ſons and other englishmens aduice in Rome giuen to his hol. as you confeſſe your ſelues. *diſorderly procured.* bicauſe it vvas procured not by the vſvall and accuſtomed order of procuring dignities ād offices in Gods church and by ſuch men as it touched not, neither by right or lavve (being dead to the vvorld) had they to deale or meddle att all in that. for 2. Ieſuits (as you confeſſe before) did *mittere falcem in meſſem alienam*, meddle vvith other mens matters. *Secularia ſecularibus, regularia regularibus*, ſaith the lavve. Lett ſecular prieſts meddle in matters apparteining to ſecular prieſts, and religious men in matters belonging to religious men. *Exorbitant* frō the office of an Archp as hath beene shevved before: for by reaſon of his large iuriſdiction it may vvell be called *Exhorbitant*, vvithout offence to his holl. or any man els: ſo long as it is not denyed but that his hol: may inſtitute ſuch an Archp: *Diſonant from reaſon*, that is to ſay: that one man should haue the Iuriſdiction of all the Archbishops and Bishops of Ingland, and Scotland. For if they had much a doe, each one to gouerne his ovvne dioceſſe, by vvhat reaſon cane one mā vvith his 12. aſſiſtants gouerne them all? Beſides the holie Canons and reaſon it ſelf vvill not that one man should haue 2. benefices, much leſſe 2. bishoppricks. Ergo it is much more diſſonant from reaſon, that one man

Fol. 7.

Fol. ibid.

Fol. 14.

C. de multa ext. de prebend.

ſupply the place and roome of ſo many Biſhops. Beſide, all this vvas ſpoken by your brethren before the Popes bull came dovvne. for ſo ſoone as they ſavve the bull, they ſubiected their reaſon, to his hol. vvill and auctoritie; vvithout asking a reaſon either vvhie or vvherefore. bicauſe his vvill in matters of benefices, is reaſon. and therefore you did ill to taxe your brethren, for that they ſaid both trulie and dulie before the coming of the breue, and vndulie to impute it to thē as ſpoken ſince the coming of the ſaid breue. the vvhich is a fovvle fault in you, if to diſcredit men vndeſeruedly, be a fault vvith you. *And to the accuſtomed practize of Gods Church.* I meruell vvhere your vvittes vveare (if you haue any at all) vvhen you laid this dovvne as ſpoken *Contemptuouſly of the dignitie and office of the Arch.* hovve can a moſt aſſured and knovvue truth be cōtempt? you are very ignorant of the practiſe of Gods Church if you knovve not this: for, vvither it be to be vnderſtood of the inſtituting of the Archp. by the Card. letters, or of his ample iuriſdiction: it is moſt true they ſaie, as hath bene euidently proued before, and you ſhal neuer be able to giue one inſtance to the contrarie. Yf you can, bring it in your larger Apol. and I vvill ſay as you ſaie, *they ſpake cōtemptuously of the dignitie.*

Vaine reprehēſion.

your vvits a vvoll gathering.

Giue one inſtance. Fol. 14. b.

The ſpeeches vvhich follovve are notd-

lowed or liked either of me, or of any ſuch vnpartiall prieſts as I am. and I leaue to them either to explicat their meaning or to recall that which they haue vnduly vttered. The which I would aduiſe both them and you to do, Wherein you are both faultie. the which Weare an euident ſigne of ſinceritie an charitie in both. God grannt you ſo to doe, this is all the hurt I Wiſhe you.

It is a foWle fault alſo to call their preten- *Fol. 15.*
ded aſſociation *a popular regiment*. But the *A nother foul*
deſire you haue to diſcredit your brēthren, *fault.*
make you to forgett what you ſaid before, ād
ſo to contradict your ſelues, as commonly al
doe that flowe in words without matter, and
ſay what they liſt without proof, as you doe
ordinarly throughout your booke. For befo-
re, you tell the tale, that they reſolued *to be-* *Fol. 7.*
gin againe by deuiſing a certaine nevv aſſocia-
tion amongſt them ſelues vvith officers and pre-
lacies of their ovvne inſtitucion, &c. and that
his Holl. ſhould be forced afterwards to con-
firme them. Nowe by theſe Prelats they mea-
ned Bishops, as they them ſelues ſay, ād you
confeſſe ſomuch your ſelues, that Bishopps
weare demaunded. and afterwards you obiect
to M. D. Bishopp ād M. Charnock, that they
vveare appointed to be Bishops. Yf this be
true, hovve dare you call that *a popular regi-*
ment, vvherein are Eccleſiaſticall officers, vn-
der a Bishopp their hedd and conductor?

Fol. 16. Contradiction. That Which enſueth: *And thus much about their contempt of impugnation of the auctoritie inſtituted by his Holl. and confirmed afterwards by an expreſſe Breue*, ſauoreth of cõtradiction. to be firſt inſtituted by his hol. and afterwards to be confirmed by his Hol. bicauſe the Popes inſtitution or collation of a benefice alWaies containeth in it expreſſe confirmation. and therefore if he had beene inſtituted by his Holl. there had beene no neede of confirmation. But bicauſe he was not laWfully inſtituted by the Card. as your brethren ſayd, and is abooue proued, therefore he hadd neede in deede of a bull called, *perinde valere* to coroborat and giue force to the firſt inualiditie and imperfect inſtitution. and ſo vvhether you vvill or no, your brethren are deliuered from *Contempt and impugnation of the auctoritie inſtituted by his hol.* ſeing theare was no ſuch inſtitution made by his Hol. but by the Card onely.

The 10. fault is an enormious fault. The 10. Fault I finde vvith you, is a fovvle and enormous fault. and I am ashamed for your ſakes, that euer vnited prieſt should be ſo farre ouer shoes as to impute that for a fault, vvhich is a ſolid and certaine article of our faith: Yea, that vvhich they ſay, is the foundation of the Cath. faith. and yet you that fight daily for that faith, finde fault vvith it. They aske: *vvho vpon earth is warranted from erring, but one? and not he in all*

Fol. 16. b

things neither, You vvonder at this doctrine and yet you confeſſe it to be true in ſome ſenſes and interpretations: and afterwards you ſay: it is *dangerous and ſcandalous to teach the people in this generall manner,* that auctoritie is not an infaillable rule of truth, in all that haue auctoritie, and by conſequence, that no man is bound in all things to beleeue vvhat euery man in auctoritie ſhall teach him, bicauſe theare is no man vpon earth vvarranted from erring but one, and not he in all things. Is not this true and cath. doctrine? is not this our faith? that euery Archbishop, bishop, and Archprieſt may erre, and that but one in the vvhill vvorld, hath the priuilege not to erre hovv can true and cath. doctrine be either *dangerous to be taught* or *ſcandalous* You haue doon both dangerouſly and ſcandalouſly, to miſlyke it in your text, and to note it in your mergent: *dangerous and offenſiue doctrine*, but to whome? mary, to men blinded vvith mallice, as you ſeeme in this place to be. vvhat? Prieſts that ſuffer for cath. Religion to finde fault vvith this propoſitiō: *None vpon earth is vvarranted from erring but one?* Why! looke better about you. is it not for this onely article that you endure priſons, chaines, and moſt cruell death: viz: that all men in the vvorld may erre in religion excepr the Pope? is not this the article that maketh vs to beleeue the Ghoſpell to be the

Hovv can cath. doctrine be ſcādalous to cath. men.

vvord of God? bicauſe the Pope that cannot erre teacheth vs, that it is the vvord of God. Haue not all thoſe that haue ſucceeded th'other xi. Apoſtles in their Seas, moſt dangerouſly erred? and vvhy? bicauſe they had not this priuilege vvhich vvas giuen to S. Peter and to his ſucceſſors onely. My beleif, for the vvhich I liue in banishment, is: that all the Prelats and ſuperiors in the vvorld may erre except his holl. vvho is Chriſts vicare and S. Peters ſucceſſor. And vvhat els doe they ſay? If I haue an erroneous faith, I praie you teach me an other in your expected Apol. In this faith I vvas baptized, in this faith norished, and for this faith (by Gods grace) I shall be reddy to shedd my blood. For this faith, our bleſſed brethren haue moſt conſtātly ſuffred martyrdoome, and for this faith heere you check your diſcontented brethren.

The prieſts checked for laying dovvne a cath. propoſition.

Ourepoore contrey may ſing vvelladay, vvelladay, to ſee heere Cath. prieſts and confeſſors to be ſo blynded in contention and deſire of reuenge, and diſcredit of their brethren prieſts, and that in defence of other men, that to their ovvne dishonor and euerlaſting diſcredit they check and finde fault vvith them for ſpeaking catholickly ād chriſtianly, to call the teachinge of the cheifeſt point and article of our Religion, *dangerous, ſcandalous, and offenſiue doctrine*. vvhither vvill mallice leade you in the end, if you goe on as

on as you haue begune? Are you ſo vnited a- *A ſtrange vniõ.*
gainſt your brethren to diſcredit them what ſoeuer it coſt you, that you diſvnite your ſelues from the cath. doctrine, from his Holl. and the cath. church? Fie vpon it. I am both ashamed and ſorie that you haue ſo ouerlashed your ſelues. They ſay: *All the prelats and ſuperiors in the vvorld may erre, his Holl. onely excepted.* You ſay: *It is ſcandalous and offenſiue doctrine.* They ſay. *Auctoritie is not an infaillable rule of truth but in one onely.* viz the Pope (who by reaſon of his auctoritie cannot erre) You ſay: *That it is a dangerous doctrine.* They ſay: *that Archprieſts, Archdiacons, yea Archbishops haue doone amiſſe and ſvvarued from the truth.* You ſay: *it may proue dangerous and ſcandalous to teach the people in this manner againſt their ſuperiors.* Why? (my maiſters) muſt truth be leſt vntaught for feare of ſcandall? where haue you learned that? and if there were any ſcandall in teaching this doctrine, as it is impoſſible there shoulde yet is it *Scãdalũ acceptũ nõ datũ.* they gaue no ſcandall in ſaying the truth, but you haue taken ſcãdall thereby, and doe by your writing ſcandaliſe others. *Væ vobis,* What? do you not teach the people thus much? *that all may erre except the Pope.* Yf you doe not, you muſt anſweare for it, bicauſe you teach them not the truth. yf you doe ſo teach, (as I am ſure you doe) what a ſhame is it then for you

The Pope cannot erre in deciding controuerſies of faith or religion.

to taxe and cheek your brethren for the same, as sowers of *dangerous, offensiue, and scãdalous doctrine*? I conclude then with them (yea with the Cath. church) that the Pope is the onely prelat that cannot erre in deciding a controuersie or doubt in faith and religion, all the world els may erre in deciding of such doubtes.

The priests vnduly checked.

But (say they) *and not he in all things*. That is: the Pope him self who hath so singular ãd eminent a priuilege not to erre in matters of faith, may yet and often dooth erre in some thinghs. I coniure and charge your conscience, as you shall answere for it at the day of iudgment, first, whither you did not knowe when you wrot this, that they meant of matters of fact: that is, that the Pope in matters of fact may erre so well as an other man. yf you did knowe it? why doe you reprehend it? Is it not a true and cath. affertion and proposition? Doe you make the Pope a God, or a man? Is not this good, true, and cathol. doctrine? The Pope is a man, and as a man may erre and synne, for he hath his passions of loue and dislike, of affection, and not affection to a man, as other men haue? he may be ill informed, and by that information doe wrõg and iniustice to another. yea there is no synne except heresie but he may commit it by his frailtie, if the bridle of Gods grace doe not keepe him in order. Is he better then

The Pope may erre in matters of fact.

The Pope is a sinfull man as others are.

S. Peter, to whome he ſucceedeth? dooth the Prophet lye him ſelf that ſaith *omnis homo mendax*. yf he or you for him should ſay he weare no ſynner, you weare both lyers by S. Iohns verdict. yf wee reſpect his ſpirituall and ſupernaturall auctoritie in forgiuing and retayning of ſynnes, in not erring in queſtiō of faith? Wee may well ſay, he is a God on earth. but if wee reſpect him as a man? he is a meere ſynner as others are, and may erre ād be deceiued by affection or information as an other man. doe you hould it for an Article of faith, that all Popes be ſaued? all in heauen and none in hell? albeit I doo piouſly thinke them all to be in heauen, yet am I not bound to beleeue it. Ans if all this which I haue ſaid, be as true as the ghoſpell, why may not the Pope erre in ſomme of his commandemēts in his inſtituting of Bishops and Archb. by falſe information? aſwell as the Archp. may erre in his decrees ād comaūdements? which yet with great abſurditie, you thinke to be abſurd, teach me (I pray you) in your larger Apologie, who hath giuen the Pope that priuilegie that he cannot erre in matter of fact, ſo Well as his inferiors, or that he hath not his paſſions ſo well as other men, or thar he cannot be deceiued and abuſed by falſehood and flatterie and by fraudulent informacion, ſo well as inferior prelats may be. teach me this, *Et eris mihi magnus Apollo*. this

The Pope for his powver, is as it vvere a God on earth.

VVhereein the Pope may erre.

is not to flatter the Pope (as you doe) nor to mainteine falſe doctrine, as you ſeeme heere to doe, by diſalowing of the true and ſincere doctrine. But this is the Chriſtian and Cath. faith that a lawyer hath learned and is bound to teach it you (you vnited diuines) Which ſeeme to be ignorant of it. The Pope him ſelf permitteth euery man (that hath intereſt therein) to ſcann and examyne his letters and bulles, and liketh well of it, bicauſe they may be gotten by ſurreption and ill informatiō: and ſo confeſſeth him ſelfe he may be deceiued and erre in matters of fact ād information. but the iuſt examen of the Arch. inſtitution by the Card. letters, haue ſo nettled him, and you his vnited brethren, that to diſgrace the dooings, ād the iuſt fact of your diſcontented brethren, you fall hedlong by forgetfulnes, into theſe groſſe and intollerable abſurdities in ſuch men as you are, as to call the Chriſtien and Cath. doctrine, *dangerous, ſcandalous, and offenſiue*, and to compte it abſurditie to ſay, his holl: *may erre in ſome of his ordonances and commādements.* In your next I praie you tell me, why *a man may not argue againſt his Holl:* (touching erring in matters fact) *by the ſame arguments vvhich they vſe againſt the Archp. and others*. For matters of fact, is he not a man, and a ſinfull (as hath beene ſaid) as they are? Ergo *vbi eſt eadem ratio, ibi erit eadem Iuris diſpoſitio.*

Groſſe abſurdities.

Fol. 16. b

But you vſe your common fraude heere to deceiue your necligent reader. they doe not, *argue agvinſt his Hol. by the ſame argument vvhich they vſe againſt the Archp.* but doe ſay the quite contrarie. They ſay: All Archpri. in the world can erre both in matter of faith and matter of fact alſo. but his Hol. of all mē in the World hath onely that priuilege, that he cannot erre in matter of faith, albeit he be not priuileged more then others, frō erring in matters of fact. howe ſay you? is this to *argue againſt his Hōll. by the ſame argument vſed againſt the Archp.* truly theſe your doings are to argue againſt all conſcience, (I will not ſay) all honeſtye. *Fraude.*

You aske: *VVhat othervvaie hereſie tooke at the begynning againſt Eccleſiaſt. Gouuernors, vvhat other gate did ſome open to hereſie?* ſurely, not this common gate, but another back gate, quite oppoſit to this. For theſe mē teache that the Pope cannot erre in matters of faith. and thoſe that opened the gate to hereſie taught and doe ſtill teach (which is the foundation ſtone of their hereſie) that the Pope and all doe and can erre, that the wholl Church (whereof wee beleeue the Pope is hedd) doo and may erre, not onely in fact (as your brethren truly teache) but alſo in faith, and religion. howe ſay you, is not this true? did not hereſie begyn with this doctrine, and dooth it not continue in the ſame ſtill? And *Fol. 17 VVhich vvay came herſy into the vvorld?*

thus your queſtions are brieflie anſweared.

Fol. ibid. vvranglers. You goe on to showe howe they *paſſed on to diminishe the credit ãd eſtimacion of their Superiors, ãd particularly of the Arch.* I ſee right well, that you are but wranglers. The Archp, in thoſe daies you talke of, was not their Superior as hath beene before prooued: that is, before the Popes bull came to confirme him Of which tyme, you talke heere quite out of time. Nay, they went about to diminish the credit of their *immediat and higher ſuperiors in Rome, to vvytt, the Card. protector and his Hol.* you might haue putt his Hol. in your purſe. for they honor and reuerence him in word and deed, aſmuch as you doe, and as they are bound to doe, as by Reading their bookes may appeere. but you will needs draWe his Hol. into the quarrel with the Protector and the Archp. as in the firſt chapt. you drawe your brethren by force into all the quarrels of Paris, Rome, and Flanders. Touching the Card. he was no more their Superior then you are myne, as I haue shewed before and therefore it is but a toy of yours to deceiue your reader and: to ſeeme to ſay ſomthing, when in deede you ſay nothing to the matter or purpoſe.

The Card. vvas not the ſuperior

Let vs heare their vndulifull ſpeeches a-

Marueillous vndutiful ſpeaches gainſt a deade Cardinal, but yet a good Cardinal as you ſay, *That vvas protector of the English college at Rome, and aftervvards be-*

nored by the title of Protector of Ingland. what vndutifull ſpeach is heere againſt him? dare you for ſhame deny that he was Protector of the college, before he was Protector of the Realme? I my ſelf and many yet liuing can re prooue you. but ſuppoſe he was not: what vndutifull ſpeach is it to ſaie, he was protector of the College? or is the vndutifull ſpeach in ſaying, he was honored with the title of Protector of Ingland? Why: was is not an honor for him to be Protector? Is not Cardinal Farneſius honored this daie with the ſame title? thinke you any Car. Would take it, if he weare not honored by it? what a vaine toy, is it, for you to finde fault with this wherein theare is no fault at all? you replie: *they doe not graunt he vvas ſo in deede, nor they did not acknovvlege him for ſuch.* howe proue you this? Mum. *Fol. 17.*

The pratector no Superior.

That which followeth, ſeemeth to be a high matter in a lowe howſe, as to ſay, they weare not bound to beleeue him in a matter of ſuch cõſequẽce. That they ſaid true herein, is proued already; that they hild him not for their ſuperior, and therefore weare not bound to obey his Ordinance. That he was not, nor that the preſent Protector as Protector nowe is not their Super. hath eal ready beene shewed, which being true, they weare not then bound to obay him.

And where you add, that they are not to giue

creditt to the Card. bare words &c. it is the ſame you repeated before, and is before like wiſe anſweared. For their accuſing him of *too much affection to the one part*, you can finde noe fault with them for the ſame. for as you report your ſelues, he was informed and inſtructed by the one partie onely, and followved the ſame parties counſell, to reiect the requeſt of the Prieſts, that would haue had a Bishop or tvvo, and to make an Archpr. and ſuch a man Archp. as that partie aduiſed him. If this be not, to be too much affected to the one partie, ād to be ouer partiall, I knovv not vvhat partiallitie and affection is.

The protector affected to one partie.

Fol. 17. b
A ſuperfluous complaint.

To leaue to other men to iudge hovve deere a Patrō and father, Card. Caietane vvas to our nation, I cannot omitt your accuſation of your brethren *For vnkyndly and vnreuerētly ſpeaking of him ſpecially in the English booke*. yf you could haue found any vnkynd or vnreuerent ſpeache, you vvould not haue paſſed it ouer ſo ſleightlie vvithout ſetting it dovvne, ſeeing you haue ſett dovvne many things of leſſer importance: note the pag. and then I vvill beleeue you. no nor then neither, till I ſee it vvith myne eyes, you haue ſo oft deceiued me. you meane perhaps that which followveth: for that they doe ſoe contemne the inſtitution of the Arch. made by hī. they are ſo farre from, to be counted vnkynde ād irreuerent for that fact, that they are to be

highly praiſed for it. He did againſt the decrees of the church therein, and they did as the Canons and conſtitutions of the church commaunded them, as hath beene ſufficiétly prooued before. You ſett this matter of reſiſting the Protector often a broche, to fill vp your booke, and vvith poore ſilly Readers to bring your diſcontéted brethren into diſcredit. but the diſcreditt turneth vpon your ovvne heds that, are ſo ignorant to beleeue and thinke, a Cardinalls bare letters conteyning in them (*by the expreſſt commandement of his Holl.*) can conferre a dignitie or benefice to any man. I am ashamed of your Ignorance being ſo many heads as you pretéd to be, ād hauing ſo many eyes amongſt you, that not one could diſcouer this fault and groſſe ignorance, but ſtill beat vpō it, as vpon your cheifeſt defence and refuge. *Ignorance.*

But alas for vvo? (my vnited brethren) vvhat is this that followeth? *They go about in one place of their booke to shevve* (the inſtitution of the Archprieſt made by the Card. Protetector) *to be voyde and vaine and of no force by* 21. *fōd Reaſons.* what is this I heare? haue they 21. Reaſons for them againſt the inſtitution of the Archprieſt? vvhat! haue you anſweared them? No forſooth. vvhat! not one of 21? no, not one. vvhy ſo? (pray you)? bicauſe they be *fond and deuiſed by themſelues, vvhereof no one hath any force at all.* Is it poſſible? you might *Fol. ibidem.* *Fol. ibidem.* *Not one of* 21. *Reaſons anſvve red.*

easely then haue answered one or two of the at the least, if your leysure, or hast offering foorth your booke had not permitted you to haue answeared all. vvhat! meane you to leave the victorie to your aduersaries, or will you answvere these reasons in your larger Apol. that is comming? I blush for your sakes that so many vnited Priests, that your Superior, and the Iesuits vvhose cause you defend, did not answvere *one fond reason of 21. vvherof not one hath any force at all.* here your Reader be he neuer so much affected vnto you, must needs stay and admyre your silence, he must needs stagger also to see you lett your aduersaries ronne avvaie vvith the victorie. I praie you, vvho is most likely to haue the truth on his syde, he that aleageth Reasons for him self, or he that sayth onely: your Reasons are *fond*, and *of no force at all*, and yet proueth no one of them to be such? This is it which I haue tould you alwaies, that you flie from the matter in question. The question is this. whither the Archpriest was not trulie and dulie instituted by the Card. letters? your Aduersarie saith no. and for profe of his assertion, he layeth dovvne 21, reasons. You comme and say: he vvas rightly and duly instituted by the Card. but you proove it not by any Reason, neither doo you confute any one of their Reasons, but onely by saying. *They are fond and of no force at all.* the poorest and simplest Co-

The Priests haue gotten the victorie.

The vnited flie from the matter in question.

bler in a toune, cann after this sort answeare the learneest man in a vvholl contrey. You conclude as vntrulie *that a Card. letters beare credit vncontrovvleable in any Catholick Court Christian* as hath beene shewed before out of *Rebuffus*. Lett the Protector of Spaigne or Frãnce send his letters to these courts saying he hath expresse cõmandemẽt from his Hol. to institute and constitute an Eccleſiasticall office that was neuer theare before, or to cõferre any benefice: his letters should not be esteemed, nor take their effects, without his Hol. expresse commission in writing.

A false conclusion.

You charge them vvith not sparing his Holl. him self, but yet according to your custome you prooue it not. Their vvords nippingly by you aleaged, as they may be vvell spoken in their sense, so prooue they not their contempt or irreuerence against his Holl. which you should prooue. For your brethren in the pag. by you alleaged, doo make a comparison betweene them selues and their aduersaries. that as their aduersaries thinke them selues more stronger to vexe them, so they, the more iniuries they suffer, the more bould and coragious they vvill be, in freely repelling of them. this is the sense of the sentence. from vvhich you haue nipped these words. vvhat immodestie (I praie you) is heere against his Hol. or what profession of libertie of speaches, is heere against

Fol. 18. The Priests are vniustly charged vvhich contempt.

Nippers.

all things and all men, as you (like ſpiders) doo gather? the compariſon there made, is betvveene thē ſelues oppreſſed, ād their oppreſſers, vvhich toucheth not at all his Hol. much leſſe all men. Amend amend, I am wearie vvith repeating your faults and follies.

Fol. 18. b. *Indignum quippe nimis gloria noſtra* (ſay they) *nec amplius ferendum duximus, &c. Wee eſteeme it to be vnvvoorthy of our glorie, and no further to be tollerated, &c.* As you doo imitate heere M. Ievvell in your *&* *cateras*, ſo muſt I ſay to you, as one ſaid to him: Coughe out my vnited Brethren, what haue you the Chyncoughe? add that which followveth in their booke, and ſee if any Chriſtien man vvill finde fault vvhich their vvords. Euery honeſt man I am ſure, vvill miſlyke of your falſe plaie, in taking that which ſerueth your turne (as you thinke) to diſcredit them, and leaue out the ſubſtannce of the matter. you haue learned this trick of nipping their vvords with an &c. of Iewell, ād ſuch ennemyes of Gods church. this then they ſaid: *vvee eſteeme it to be vnvvorthy of our glorie and no further to be tollerated, that vvee, vvhich are ſent by the Sea Apoſtolick* (in to Ingland) *to dravve other men out of Shiſme, and to bring them into Chriſtes fold, ſhould be falſely defamed throughout the vvholl vvorld to be Schiſmaticks our ſelues, and to haue giuen ſuch horrible ſcandals and to be coumpted and iudged ſuch.* your, &c. being thus diſcouered and enlarged, vvhat

Th'vnited haue the chyncoughe.

A vvorthie Speache.

fault cann you finde vvith this ſpeache ? a ſpeach vvorthy men of their profeſſiō. they were haynouſly ſlaundered by Fa. Liſters ſcādalous booke of ſchiſme, wherein he affirmed (vvithout proof) that they were ſchiſmaticks and vvorſt then ſooth ſayers. vvhat contempt of his Hol. is theare in theſe words? and yet forſooth to prooue they contemned him, this place is brought and alleaged. ſurely your witte vveare ouer whelmed with ouer much mallice or paſſion, when you vvrott this your Booke, the which ſo blinded you, that you thought euery thing they vvrott, vvas in contempt of his Hol. els would you neuer haue cited this place for an example.

As foolishlie you ſett downe their words out of the English booke againſt thē, which are ſpoken very prudently and Iudiciouſly. For if the Pope dooth not vſe to giue the ſimplieſt benefice that is, but by the ordinary waie, vvith his Bulls: vvho cann preſume, that he vvould ſo baſely eſteeme of the English Clergie, vvhich is in contynuall fight vvith the enemyes of that Sea, and ſpecially for the preeminēce of that Sea, as to gieue them a Superior by thaduiſe of 2. Ieſuits and one ſecular Prieſt, extraordinaryly and without his buls. You ſhould haue anſwered this vehement preſumption, which ſtādeth on your diſcōtented brethrens ſide, againſt the Card. letters, and not to haue drawne their vvords

Fol. 18. b. vvell ſpoken.

(vncharitably) as ſpoken in contempt of his Hol. which are nothing ſo.

Fol. 18.b. A reaſonable Speache.

Then they tell you plainly that there is *greet reaſon why his Hol. should not appoint a Superior ouer them vvithout their aduiſe and allovvance: and that in dooing contrarie he should doo againſt the Canons of the Church, and againſt the decrees of Popes and Emperours, &c.* howe ſay you (my Maiſters)? is it not great Reaſon the Clergie should choſe their Superior? haue Popes againſt Reaſon made ſo many notable decrees touching Elections? haue they occupied their vvitts and auctoritye in a matter vnreaſonable? yf Election be reaſonable in others, why is it not reaſonable in Ingland? yf it be reaſonable that the Clergie of other Contryes choſe their Bishops, Deanes, and Prouoſts, vvhy is it not reaſonable in Ingland, that the Clergie should choſe their ſuperior? I ſee no reaſon of diuerſitie, touching the Reaſonablenes of the fact or act. You thinke it is a ſufficient confutatiō to alleage their vvords onely, and you thinke all men ſo blinded as you your ſelues are that cann ſee no Reaſon in them. vvhen they are moſt reaſonable you anſwere neither their Reaſons, their examples, nor auctorityes, aud yet you vvill haue men of Reaſon to beleeue you vvithout reaſon at all. you quoate their auctorities in your margent, and yet you vvill make vs beleeue they haue no Reaſon, and

Tot. tit. Ext. de Elect.

Th'vnited neuer anſvvere Reaſon nor auctoritie.

by conſequent the Canons which they aleage, to be againſt Reaſon, bicauſe they are againſt you, and that you cannot anſwere them.

The Canons (ſay they) *doo allovve, that the Clergie may and should (if they finde them ſelues vvronged by having a Bishopp put on them against their conſent and liking) reſiſt and vvithſtand the intruded.* But they haue an Archp. ſett ouer them without their conſent and liking, ergo according to the Canons, they may reſiſt and vvithſtand him. and ſo by conſequence, this their reſiſting him is reaſonable bicauſe they are vvarranted by the Canons. what ſay you to this argument? you are as Domb as Fiſhes. heere you shoulde haue shevved your conning, learning, and Rhetoricke, and haue anſweared this argument or Canons, and ſo haue triumphed after the victorie, and not before, as often you doo. but being by the Truth ſtrooke ſtarke domb, you leaue, vvill you or nill you, the victorie to your aduerſarie, and giue thereby your Readers to vnderſtand, that they had reaſon to withſtand, and not to accept the Archprieſt at his firſt comming in ſo deſorderly, and againſt the Canons as he did, your Brethren in all their books and diſcourſes, putt this dovvne as an infaillable ground, ād as it vveare the corner ſtone of all their vvritings and ſayings: *that the Archprieſt vvas put on them at the firſt, againſt*

Th'vnited triumphe before the victorie.

The corner ſtone of the queſtion untouched.

th'orderly course of appointing and constituting Superiors either by the Canons, or of the Pope. This is in dispute, and this ground you should haue vndermyned, and shewed the contrarie, either by lawe or by practise. but as I haue alwaies told you, you flie from it, and shewe your selues cowards. This is not the questiō vvhich you seeme to insinuat, and would make your Readers to beleeue it, that they should saie and hold: *that the Pope could not giue them such a Prelat vvith so large and ample Iurisdiction, or vvithout their consents and election.*

Not the question.

Note well, they neuer said or thought this, neither can you of this iustly accuse them. if you cann shewe me that they teache or haue vvritten this, then vvill I crie out on them as yon doo, and call them Schismaticks iustly, as they haue beene called vvrongfully. For this were to abbridge in deede the eminent power his Hol. hath *Ex plenitudine potestatis*, to giue Iurisdiction to vvhome he list, and as largely and amplie as he list. Marke these points vvell. for it is one thing to say: *A superior is putt vpon vs against Reason and the orderly manner and practise that euer hitherto hath beene obserued in Christes church*, and a nother thing to say: *his Hol. cannot appoint vs such a superior vvith such auctoritye ouer vs against our vvills*: for the former, is a lavvfull and iust cōplaint, and the seccond is a schismaticall Pride.

The Popes eminent but not ordinary povver

But

But what if they doo not ſpeake as you make them to ſpeake? vvhat if you vſe M. Ievvells tricks, to foyſt in vvords that are not theirs, as if they had ſpoken them, ſo to diſcredit them vvith your partiall or negligent Reader? vvhat if you haue put dovvne your ovvne vvords in a ſmall and diſtinct lettre, as though they vveare their vvords? if you haue done all this, cann you abſtaine from bluſhing? are you not ashamed of it, pretending to defend truth, and to committ ſo great an vntruth? hovve cann your Reader beleeue you in other points you ſay againſt them, vvhen he shall ſee you ſo fraudulently both to accuſe them, ād deceine him? vvho vvould haue thought vnited Prieſts to be ſo much ouer ſeene? I pray God you be not vnited as Sampſons foxes vveare, to deſtroy by your contentious ſpirits the good corne of gods church, and by this occaſiō of ouer much affecting one partie, be not the loſſe of many a Soule. Yf you be vnited Prieſts that ſpeake, and not an other vnder your name, I vvill ſett dovvne their vvords, as you haue ſett them dovvne in your booke, and aftervvards the ſame vvords according as I finde thē in their booke, in the pag. by you noted, and leaue the iudgement hereof euen to the partialleſt Reader that is, if he haue any vvitt, Iudgement or honeſtie in him. Thus you ſay: *And a little after they tell vs plainly that theare is great*

False plaie.

The Readers are fraudulently deceiued, and the Prieſts falſely accuſed.

Reaſon vvhy his Hol. ſhould not appoint a ſuperior in Ingland vvithout their aduice and allovvance, and that in dooing contrarie, he ſhould doo againſt the Canons of the church and againſt the decrees not onely of Popes, but alſo of Emperours (as though this vveare more) vvhich appoint that the Clergie may reſiſt and vvithſtand any Bishopp put vpon them againſt their conſent and liking. All this you haue putt dovvne in a ſmall and diſtinct letter as their vvords. Novve let vs heare them ſpeake.

Diſtinct. bb. ca. 12. & diſt. 61. cap. 3.

Pag. 14. *For, vvhoſe aduice, conſent, and allovvance are required to the choſing of a Superior, if not theirs that are to obey and liue vnder the ſaid ſuperior vvhen he is choſen? doo not the fellovves of euery hovvſe in oxford (and according to the ſtatuts and foundation) choſe and elect their hedd and Rector? Doo not likevviſe all the Religious companies choſe their ſuperior? Nay, doo not the Canons of holy church decree, that Prieſts ſhould haue the election of their Bishopp? and this late auctoritye is for amplenes in punishing more then Bishoplike. yea the Canons alovve further, that the Clergie may and ſhould (if they finde them ſelues vvronged, by having a Bishopp put on them againſt their conſent and liking) refuſe and vvithſtand the intruſion and iniurie. and not onely Popes haue decreed that their Clergie ſhould choſe their Bishopps, but Emperours haue conſtituted the ſame, as appeareth by the ordinary Gloſſe vpon 63. diſt. cap. 34. all vvhich maketh our frends refuſall much more iuſtifiable.* Where doo they

Diſt. 63. c. 12. diſt. 61. c. 13.

tell vs plainly, that there is great Reaſon why his Hol. should not appoint a ſuperior in Ingland without their *aduice and allovvance?* haue you not foyſted in theſe vvords *aduice* and *Allovvance*? and that in dooing contrarie, *he should doo againſt the Canons*? vvhere is there any one word of his Hol. or of his power in the former vvords? they shewe both by example and by auctoritye that the ordinary comming to ſuperioritie ouer others, is by the election of ſuch as are to liue vnder that ſuperior: and that the Clergie may refuſe a Bishopp ſett ouer them againſt their cõſent and liking. and there vpon conclude, that the Prieſts which vvithſtood the Archprieſt ſett ouer them vvithout their cõſent and liking, to be iuſtified by the ſame examples and auctoritye. you put your ovvne vvords dovvne for theirs, as thoughe they ſpake contemptuouſly of his holynes (for that you goe about to prooue in the ſame leafe before, ād bring this for example) vvhereas it is you your ſelues and not they, they not once mentioning his Hol. but laying dovvne a true and ſolid Doctrine proued by example and auctoritye to the vvhich you anſvveare not onevvord heere. And you are not content to corrupt their vvords onely, but their allegation alſo, as the Reader may perceiue heere in the margent, ſett dovvne both at your vvords and at theirs And vvhen you haue framed them

False addition.

Falshood.

Corruption of vvords and allegation.

A false conclusion.

such a speech as pleaseth you, then you conclude thus: *By all vvhich, is not hard to Iudge of these mens haughtie spirits.* But I conclude: By all vvhich, your vniust dealing vvith your brethrē, it is not hard to Iudge of your naughtie spirits. for you haue corrupted both their sense and their text. Fie vpon Contention vvhich ingendreth mallicie, and Mallicie is the mother of willfull blyndenes. For whereas they saie: *Not onely Popes but Emperours haue constituted, &c.* thereby to shovve hovve the lavves eonsent with the Canons, as the Emperour him self often saith: *Sancimus, sacras per omnia sequentes regulas. vvee doo ordaine, follovving altogether the sacred Canons.* and the Pope saith: *Quia vero sicut leges non dedignantur sacros Canones imitari, ita & sacrorum statuta Canonum, principum constitutionibus adiuuantur. Novv as the lavves doo not disdaine to imitat or follovve the sacred Canons: so the statuts of the sacred Canons are ayded by the lavves and Constitutions of Princs:* You interpret their vvords, that they alledge the Emperours auctoritye after the Pope, as a greater auctoritye then the Popes, for so your words in the text (and for more suretie, sett dovvne in the margent also) doo notifie. (*as though this vveare more.*) as if you vvould say: these men allege the Emperours auctoritye, after they haue aleaged the Canons, *as thoug it vveare more*, that is, greater then the auctoritye of the Canons. you may

Auth. de monach. §. huic autem.

C. 1. Ext. de novi operis.

False Interpretation.

aſwell accuſe the Pope for ſaying, that the Canõs are helpt by the lavves of Princs. what blindenes is this againſt your ovvne conſcié-ce and skyll, to miſinterpret mens vvords, and to make your Reader to note a falſe ſenſe, which your brethren neuer intended, neither cann it by any ſpider be ſucked out of them. this is not a haughtie, but a cõtentious and ſeditious ſpirit. To conclude for anſvvere to their Canons and ordinary gloſſe, you ſay, they are of *a haughtie ſpirit*. vvhy ſo? forſooth bicauſe they alledge the Canons and theordinary Gloſſe. I pitty your ignorance, and bevvaile the vveakenes of your cauſe. For in ſteade of ſolid anſvveres, you corrupt both the ſenſe and the text of your Aduerſarie. you make him ſaie vvhat you liſt, and vvhen all is doon, that which you make him ſay, remayneth ſtill firme and ſtable, vntouched and vnanſwerred by you. Suerly you are like to get great honor and creditt by this kynd of writing and dealing: euen aſmuch as Iewell (vvhome you imitat) did get, vvhich vvas shame enough.

Blinde and miſinterpretarum.

A haughtie anſvvere.

Novve you accuſe them of diſorder *for that they did call into ſuſpition of forgerie the Popes breue it ſelf, that came to confirme the Protectors letters.* They ſay the contrarie. *that a Peace was made to the great comfort of all Catholicks, vvhen his Hol. breue vvas preſented vnto them, and that all vvas forgiuen by the Prieſts ſo greuously inju-*

Fol. 19.

Contrarietie. Pag. 1. in the preface.

Fol 109. ried. and you your ſelues confeſſe, that in vvords they acknovvleged his auctoritye aleaging their words vvhich are theſe: Pag. 4. in the preface. *yf they meane thereby that the Prieſts doo not acknovvlege M. Blackvvell for their Archprieſt and ſuperior (ſince his Hol. breue came) they may if it pleaſe them* Fol. 109. *correct this their vnderſtanding, &c.* You replie yet for all this, that *they ſeeke by all poßible* Fol. 19. *meanes to diſcredit his auctoritye.* and vvhy? bycauſe they ſay: *the breue vvas procured, God knovveth out of vvhat office.* you note not the place vvhere they ſay it, and therefore I will not beleeue you, nor your, &c. But ſuppoſe they did ſuſpect the breue of forgerie, yea and vvent about to proue it alſo, vvhat then? Is this a fault, or a ſynne? is this contempt of his holynes? nothing leſſe. for ſomuch as it is lavvfull for all men againſt vvhome any Breue or bull is obteyned, to impugne it, yea and to prooue it falſe and forged too, if they can: and good Reaſon. for it may be obteyned by falſe information, and ſo his Hol. may be deceiued, vvho intendeth not to graunt any thing in the preiudice of an other, or againſt an other mans right. this is no contempt of his Hol. or of his bulls, but lavve and Reaſon. you doo very ill therefore to accuſe your Brethren falſely in ſaying: they called into ſuſpition of forgerie the bulles, vvhereas ſo ſoone as they ſavve it, they yelded vvithout further enquierie, vvhither it

One may lavvfully ſuſpect a breue or bull of forgerie.

Falſe accuſatiõ.

vveare obtayned *iuſtè* or *iniuſtè*, or vvhither it vvas forged or no.

That vvhich you aleage out of the English booke, might be more charitably interpreted, and not to the rigour you doo, and as I beleeue, contrarie to their ſenſe and meaning. which I leaue (vvith many other things) for them ſelues to anſvvere. for as I haue often ſayd, I doo onely aduertiſe you of ſuch faults as you committ in this Apol. not intending to defend them in their faults and errors, but am full gladd vvhē you take them vp iuſtly, and correct them vvherein they are faultie. for as I meane not to defend them, vvherein they are reprehenſible, ſo doo I not meane to flatter you vvhen you are faultie. As for example, in your vncharitable and diſorderly concluſion of this your ſecond Chapt. vvhich proceedeth not of that ſpirit, vvhich should be in men of your calling and qualitie, tovvards your brethren runing the ſame courſe, and perill of perſecution that you doo: but rather of the ſpirit you make mention of there, *pride*, *vvrath*, *Envie*, *Emulation*, and vvorſe paſſions if worſe may be. God ſend the one and the other of you his holie ſpirit of vnitie and charitie, for ſuerly it is high tyme.

Fol. 19. b. Pag. 29. & 103.

Uncharitable interpretation.

A diſorderly concluſion.

CHAP. III.

Fol. 20. b.

THE Fathers of the ſocietie are vvorthy of greater praiſe then you giue them, and weare vvorthy of more, if they had not meddled in this controuerſie, which nothing perteyned to them, and had ſuffred the ſecular Prieſts to followe their affaires, being 2. diſtinct bodyes ād comō wealthes as they are. But this medling ſo farre in a matter not apperteyning to them, doth giue mé ſuſpition, they tend to ſomme other end, and make their frends full ſorie to ſee contemplatiue men plonged ſo deepely in vvorldly affaires, and ſo vp to the eares in ſtrif and contention.

One il herbe marreth a vvhole pott of pottage.

But that vvhich followeth as it ſhould ſeeme greatly to pleaſe you, ſo it much diſliketh me, and all of my humor, as ſpoken in diſgrace and diſcredit of ſecular Prieſts, but eſpecially of ſuch as haue and doo trauell in England, for the gayning of Soules. I vvill ſett it dovvne to ſee if it can make you blush, ſo to diſcredit your ovvne coate and vocation.

Diſgrace of ſecular Prieſts.

Fol. 20. b.

Yea diuers, that be hedds novve of faction againſt them (the Ieſuits) *are ſo farre beholdinge to them, as probably they had neuer beene men of learning and accompt, if theſe Religious men, and their charitie had not beene.* What an im-

pudent ly is this ? vvhy ? D. Bagshavv, whome they accompt the cheif, D. Bishop M. Champeney, and others the heds of the faction againſt thē, Would they (thinke you) neuer haue beene men of accompt, if they hadd not gone to Rome? what if they had ſtaid in Rhemes, or Douay? is theare no learning but in the Rom. college at Rome? be they all Aſſes and vnlerned not able to write bookes that weare brought vp in the ſeminaries of Rhemes and Doway? All you vnited prieſts (the grateſt part neuer being brought vp vnder the fathers) are you not men of learing and accompt? and able to vvrite bookes how then wrote you this your Apologie? paraduenture it was vvritten by a Romiſt and not by a Rhemiſt. but vvhat? are all the learned men of our contrey beholdinge to theſe Religious for it? God forbid. yea but Why are men ſomuch beholden *to thes religious*: Mary, *ſomme of thē* (the ſecular prieſts) *going ouer poore ſeruing men, other ſoldiers, others vvanderers in the vvorld, and none lightlie but more or leſſe, onevvaie or other, in neede of their helpe and fauor, &c.* Far othevviſe doth their great friēd And. Philopatris (pag. 199.) vvrite of them: that thoſe vvho come to the Seminaries, are for the moſt part deſcended of vvourshipfull families, and borne of rich parente. What! diuers of theſe that be heds nowe of the factiō againſt the Ieſuits, weare they

an impudent ly.

Fol. ibidem.

Impudencie.

ſuch men as you mention heere? name one of them to ſaue your honeſtie. For heds, in al your booke, you recken D. Bagsh. D. Bish. M. Mush. M. Bluet, M. Chãpeney, M. Collington, M. Charnock (put in alſo M. Watſon if you will:) vveare theſe poore ſeruing men, ſouldiers, or vvanderers, vvhen they came ouer? what impudency is this? vvhat calumniation both of the vocation and of the perſons? you tell the reader heere, that the heds vveare ſuch companions as you haue named, but name no man heere. yet aftervvards, you recken theſe vvhome I haue named for the heds of the faction, by conſequence then, you vvould haue your ignorãt Reader, (that neither knovveth the men, nor their education) to thinke, that thoſe vveare theſe *poore ſeruing men, ſouldiers, and vvanderers* vp and dovvne, vvhich if the Ieſuites of charitie (forſooth) had not taken in, they vvould neuer haue come to this learnĩg to be able to vvrite books againſt them. Beleeue them vvho liſt, this I am aſſured of, that if it vveare true, and that a Ieſuit vvrot this booke, he then dooth like an vnhappy covve, that after shee hath giuen a good meales milke, ſtriketh the payle downe vvhich her heele. Euenſoe, if the Ieſuits had doone ſomuch for theſe kind of men as your pretend, you ſhould not by vpbraiding them therevvith blemish and deface all the good deeds you ſay

An vnhappy Cowe.

they did them. And yet this not vvithſtãding vvhich you ſaie heere can ſcarcely be true. for theſe Souldiers, ſeruing men, and vvanderers, did very rarely goe to Rome to be holpen by the Ieſuits, and very fevve or none of thẽ were made prieſts there, but vvere ſtill receiued in Douay and Rhemes, there brought vp, and prieſted. Beſides, vveare it true, that all theſe *Souldiers*, and *Vvanderers* hãd gotten this learning to vvrite bookes of the Ieſuits, yet the oppoſition of theſe prieſts againſt that vnorderly and exorbitant ſuperioritie obteyned by the Ieſuits, is ſo farre frõ ingratitude againſt them, that it is, a notable fact of conſcience and Iuſtice both.

And your *Probably they had neuer beene mẽ of learning or accompt, nor able to vvrite bookes*, if they had not beene brought vpp vnder the Ieſuits: is very fondly ſaid on your part, and to the Ieſuits them ſelues alſo diſhonorable, and cauſe of iuſt enuie. As vvho should ſaie: that either there vvas no learning in the vworld before the Ieſuits appeered, or no learned man novve, if he hath not beene brought vp vnder the Ieſuits, vvhich is both folly to beleeue: and ſhame to vtter and vvrite.

A ſpeache dishonorable to the Ieſuits.

But lett vs examine theſe 4. vvhome you ſett dovvne as cheif hedds: viz. D. Bagsh M. Bluet, M. Collingt. and M. Mush. (vvho to you ſeeme the cheifeſt broachers of all thes *Fol. 19. b*

Fol. 68.b

ſuſpitious reports.) The firſt, to vvhome you attribut *the penning of the Latins booke*, vvas a Graduat and of accompt in Oxford before he came ouer. Yf he had contynued theare, and neuer comme ouer, or if he had ſtaid at Rhemes and not gone to Rome, is it not probable he might haue proued a man of learning, and able to vvrite ſuch a booke? vvhie: did he learne his latin tong in Rome? as for M. Bluet and M. Collingt. they vveare neuer vnder the Ieſuits, but brought vp in the ſeminarie of Douay, and vveare both gone home to ſerue their contrey, before any Ieſuit had any gouernement in our ſeminaries, and ſo for the learning and abilitie they haue, not bound to the Ieſuits, and conſequently cannot be ingratfull: In deede M. Mush (vvho yet by your ovvne iudgment is the auctor, *but of* 2. *letters*, and of no one booke) he vvas brought vp in Rome for ſomme yeares. but hadd he not gone thither, but remayned and ſpent ſo many yeres in Douay or Rhemes, should not he probably haue gottē learning enough to vvrite 2. letters and a booke too, if neede vvere? three of theſe heds therefore at leaſt are not endebted to the Ieſuits for their learning and habilitie to vvrite bookes and therefore cannot commit any ingratitude, in vvriting in ſo iuſt and equitable a cauſe as they haue to vvrite againſt ſomme of thē, eſpecially thoſe that vvrott and confirmed

The heds not ingrat to the Ieſuits.

the booke of ſchiſme, which was written ād penned againſt them. Beſides the ſtyle and manner of writing, this place aiſo dooth diſcouer the penner of this Apol. who omitteth noe occaſion (as before I haue noted) to abaſe and bring into contempt the vocation, of ſecular prieſts. For howe can it be probable that you vnited prieſts should obiect to your brethren as a great diſgrace to them, of a ſeruing man to be made a prieſte, of a ſouldier to be prieſted? The canons of the church do not repell from prieſthood the verie ſlaues, ſo they be made prieſts after they haue beene ſett free by their Maiſt. yea he whoſe Father was a ſlaue, ſo his mother be a free vvoman, may be made a prieſt. and was not I praie your the founder of the Ieſuits order a Souldier, and is the ſocietie to be vpbraided therewith? God forbid. Bought ſlaues I ſay are admitted, and you obiect to free men, as a wrinckle and fowle blott to prieſthood: bycauſe of ſeruing men and ſouldiers, they became good and vertuous prieſts, and for that they forſooke the world to ſerue God in his church, and for that they let the killing of bodies, to helpe to ſaue Soules. You doe iniurie not onely to many of your ſelues (my vnited brethren) amongſt whome yet I knowe ſomme that weare ſeruing men: but alſo to many a holie martyr, that of ſeruing men yea and of meane qualitie, by their zeale and

The author of the Apologie diſcouered.

Tot. tit. ext. de ſeruis non ordinandis.

C. fin. d. tit.

The vnited doe iniurie themſelues.

constancie haue come to the height of perfe-ction which is Martyrdoome, to the with I feare me, the Author of this Apol. vvhoſoe-uer he be Will neuer attaine, ſo long as he hath his hedd ſoe full of theſe contentiõs ád vncharitable dealings, augmenting them by ſuch fond bokes, as haue neither rythme nor reaſon in them. howe ſay you to one (whom ſynce I haue heard to be martyred) that vvas firſt a Cobbler. then a Porter, after that vn-dercooke in the ſeminarie, and at laſt by his extreame diligence gott aſmuch learning as was ſufficient for a prieſte, and finally ſuch fa uor at Gods hands to be a Martyr: Whereas you by Gods ſecreat iudgments hane beene as it weare for ſaken, and left to be dealers ád ſticklers in this vncharitable diſſention. what ſay you to M. Iames Cleyton Who being a ſmith in Ingland came to Rhemes, and thea-re trauailled ſomuch and profited ſo Well in his ſtudie, that D. Allen (a man of an other iudgment and ſpirit then this author Who-ſoeuer he be) adiudged him worthy of prieſt-hood. he was not deceiued in his iudgment, for this man after long impriſonement, was at length condemned for his faith, but died in priſon before the day of execution. Goe nowe and obiect to that vvorthy Prelat of pious and famous memorie Card. Allen, that he made not onely ſeruing mẽ and ſouldiers prieſts, but alſo Coblers and ſmithes. I reſer-

Coblers and ſmythes, prieſts and martyrs.

M. Joannes Cleyton.

D. Allen of an other iudgmẽt.

ue the names of many ſeruing men that after they came to Douay and Rhemes weare made prieſts, and haue doon much good in their contrey, and many of them haue died for the cath. faith moſt conſtantly. Yf you knovve them not, their names are written in *Libro vitæ*. You may aſvvell and iuſtly reproche to S. Peter, S. Andrevv, S. Iohn, that they vveare fiſchers and ſo vnfitt to be Apoſtles.

Many ſeruing men prieſts and Martyrs.

Souldiers (quot you?) hovve many I praie you? tell their names. I knowe ſeruing men that becameSouldiers, and afterv vards coming to the ſeminarie were made prieſts: but any that vvas a mere Soldier, I knovve none eſpecially of the heds, as you terme thē, nor any of the 30. vvich ſubſcribed to the appeale, except the tvvo Bennets, vvhereof the one in deede vvas a Souldier, and after made Prieſt in Rome, vvhither the other vvas or no I knovve not, but for the reſt, I can anſvvere negatiuely.

Well? theſe *Seruing men*, *Souldiers*, and *vvāderers*, one vvaie or other, ſtoode in neede of the Ieſuits helpe. What? to make them prieſts? and to haue the habilitie to vvrite bookes? or els in that they gaue them bread at their gates, a meales meate, or a nights lodging. For the firſt, they gayned it in the Seminaries. For the ſeccond, I knovve heretofore our contreymen haue found charitie ād frendship at their hands, but for ſome yeares

ſince, if all be true that Paſſingers, trauaillers and vvanderers (be they ſeruing men, ſouldiers, ſchollers, or others) report. they may aſſoone breake their necks as their faſts, at a Ieſuits college. And might ſtarue if they foũd not more charitie and better releife at other mens hands then theirs. Somuch is the old helpe of the Iefuits changed, that they vvill haue no Inglishman ſtand in neede of them. For if he doe, he may be deceiued. I am ſorie our contreymen haue giuen ſuch occaſion: but more ſorie to ſee the fathers for ſomme reſpects, ſo to change their charitable natures. For hovvſoeuer thes *Souldiers* and *vvanderers*. shevv them ſelues forgetfull and vngrat full, yet should not the Fathers for that becomen nigrads and vncharitable.

The Jeſuits ould charitie tovvards Euglishmẽ changed.

But to cloſe vvith you. I praie you vvhat helpe and fauor haue theſe *ſeruing men*, *ſouldiers*, and *vvanderers*, ſpecially the heds of them, found at the Ieſuits hands. I vvould faine knovve for my learning. I am ſure of this, that the greateſt part (if not all) haue foũd helpe and fauor and not of the Ieſuits as you inſinuat, but in the Semin. to be norished in learning. yf in our ſemin. of douay ãd Rhemes, theare had not beene vſed more charitie to commers and vvanderers then is or hath beene in the Seminaries gouerned by the Ieſuites, or that novve is in the ſeminary of Douay gouerned by their vvill and direction,

More charitie vſed in the Seminary of Douay and Rhemes then in thoſe gouerned by the Ieſuits.

ction, you had loſt this good argument of *Seruing men, ſouldiers* and *vvanderers*, our cõtrey had loſt many a good prieſts and holy martyr that haue beene receiued, entretayned and norished in thoſe ſeminaries, vvhich nowe may go a vvandring in deede, if they haue neither money in their purſe, nor commendations from certaine men in Ingland! O good Cardinal! thou ſeeſt the great change that is happened ſince thy death, and no doubt thou dooſt lament it. thou receyueſt all that came, *Seruing men, ſonldier*, heretick, and all: thou refuſeſt none, and thy charitable dealing brought forthe the frute that followed. Not onely *Seruing men*, and *ſouldiers*, vnder thy happy, wiſe, and diſcreat gouernement weare made prieſts, but many an heretick alſo Was conuerted, prieſted and ſent back, and after vvards became a bleſſed martyr, ſo God bleſſed they zeale and charitie. But novv alas! both charitie and zesle are vvaxen ſo colde, that fewe comme ouer, and many of them retorne, not onely fruſtrated of their zealous hope, but malcontented and keycold.

The ſeminary of Douay meruey-louſly changed.

To conclude, yf theſe *ſeruing men, ſouldiers* and *vvanderers*, nowe prieſts haue not receyued ſuch helpe and fauor of the Ieſuits as you pretend, then you taxing them with ingratitude is vndue. and if all be true you ſay, then you conclude againſt your ſelues (Yf you

weare the Authors of this Apol.) in that there are are amongst you, mo of these *seruing mē, souldiers*, and *vvanderers*, novve priests, then amongst your discontented brethren, and so haue you made a fayre spoke, by prooving your selues ingratfull fellovves, as you are in deede to your ovvne coate and vocation, in abasing and bringing it into cōtempt to, please and praise others.

The vnited proue them selues ingrat.

That which you say in the same leafe and elswhere, touching their disordinat writing against the fathers in generall and against far. Parsons in particular, I dissalowe vvith you, and for that kind of writing, I haue alvvaies founde fault with their bookes, and am as sorie that euer they vvrott so as you are for the booke of schisme. yf they had kept them selues with in the compasse of the question, and not spoken so against the parsons they doo: their boke vvould haue passed without controvvlement. but seeing they haue beene so bold, touch them hardly, and lay loade on them, I will not mislike vvith you. so that still you call to memorie, that the biting, passionat, and sclanderous book which fa. Lister wrott against them, might haue pushed thē into the like disordered heate, and liberty of speech. For Wee haue a rule in our lawe, that *Compensatio habet locum in delictis*, that is: one iniurie may be compensed vvith an other, The Iesuite called them schismaticks, and

Fol. 22. Vvhat is to be disliked in the priests?

worse then soothsayers and idolaters, and for recompense they call the Iesuites ambitious &c. one is as true as the other, both are false and so an end.

To putt downe my verdict touching your discontented brethrens censure of these so many seminaries that nowe are in respect of the two vvee had onely before, true it is. The fathers and especially fa. Parson. (by vvhose speciall trauaill and industrie they haue beene erected, and as yet are mayneteyned) are highlie to be thanked, and gretly to be estemed for the same: and no doubt but in tyme our contrey shall reape great good and profitt thereby: so is it true also, that the 2. elder Seminaries did send into Inglant mo priests, and norished in them greater nombers of schollers at one tyme (I thinke) then these newe seminaries, vvith the old now decayed vvlll furnishe to send into Ingland in diuers yeares. and for the nomber of studēts, priests and proper yonthes, theare vveare moe for many yeares together (so long as D. Allen gouerned) in those seminaries at one tyme, then are novve, or here after like to be in all the seminaries put them all together. I haue seene 50. priests in one yere sent out of Rhemes, and yet 50. other priests remaine in the college still. haue all the Seminaries so many in them novve? No no, the reasons vvhy the seminaries flovved then in nomber, are: first

The authors iudgment of the nō bers of nevve seminaries.

D. Cicil. in his spectacles yet attributeth the begynning of th' seminaries in in spaine in to his industrie, ād that fa. Pars. did build vpon his foūdation.

The 2. Seminaries flovved more in nomber, then all doe together novve. And vvhy?

bicauſe all that came to Douay or Rhemes vveare receiued and vvellcomme none vve-
All vvere vvel-comen. are reiected, had they money or had they none, brought they commendations or brought they none. After they had beene tried theare a vvhile, ſuch as vveare not foūd fitt (vvhich god knovvth vveare but fevve) vveare graciouſly and courtuouſly diſmiſſed vvith money in their purſes. But nov if they haue no money, no meate: if they haue no commendations from ſpeciall parſons in Ingl., *Neſcio vos*, and ſo retorne as they came

When it vvas knovvne in our vniuerſities, hovve all vveare receiued and full vvelcome that came, a nomber of the cheifeſt and beſt ſchollers and vvytts of both vniuerſities came flocking ouer. but noW it being knowne that noneare Welcome Without money ād particular commendatiōs, none or verie feWe
The gouernemēt more ſweete. dare aduenture. Next, they liued then very quietly Without rigourous rules and penaūces or *dicitur culpa*, gouerned and ruled by the countenance and looke of one mā, Whome all from higheſt to the lovveſt did looue, and highlie reuerēce. But noWneWe laWes haue altered the ſtate of the ſeminarie, and make men vnWilling to come theare. yf you Will anſWere here (as you doe elſvvhere) that the Seminarie is novve poore, and the-
Fol. 25. Obiection. Anſvvere. refore muſt diminish the nomber to paie their debts? I mervell it hauing ſo fevve, it

can be so poore the Popes exhibition contynueth, and so dooth the kings of Spaigne. Who as you report hath euer since the yeare 1583. giuen the seminarie 2000. Crownes a yeare, the payment whereof hath euer since beene procured by Fa. Parsons labor and trauaill. But for all your saying, I thincke the king of Spaignes exhibition hath beene the slower paid, bicause his liberalitie was withdrawne from thence, to be bestowed on the seminaries that weare in Spaigne. I thinke also the poore seminary getteth litle out of England, bicause since Card. Allens death, theare haue beene newe collectors that bestowe it elswheare, as tyme the daughter of Truth will discouer. But whie doe I call your seminary poore, that hath but fewe moonethes since receyued 2000 crownes. And expect dayly 2000. moe? I may then very well conclude with your discontented brethren, that the newe seminaries haue almost destroied the old? as reason and experience it self dooth teach. For euery man by nature is more addicted, and more carefull of that which he hath him self begonn and sett vp, ād to ēcrease it, rather thē to mainteyne that. Which was begoone by another. For that which one liketh, another disliketh. That of Douay was founded by Card. Allen now deade and out of mynde: the others, by fa. Par. that hath credit to mainteine them. Another

Fol. 24.

Fol. 25. *b*

may comme after that will care for none of all these, but sett vp another elswhere. *Est enim vicissitudo rerum*, I doubt not but Sa. Pardooth endeuour to maintaine the old Seminaries, if not in their ancient splendour, yet at the least to see that they doe not vtterly fall downe and decay. Which weare great pittie, and a Wonderfull losse to our contrey

Fal. 27. 29. The author of the Apol. discouereth him self to be a Iesuit.

In the end of the 3. Chapt. the auctor of this booke discouereth him self to be a Iesuit (as I my self alwaies gessed and as all men that reade it diligently, must needs gesse also For, the conuersion of all in England is attributed to them, and you vnited brethren, are but lookers on, and made but Cyphers in Algorisme. Mary, yet least he shold take all the praise from you, in recompence of borrowing your names, he will content you with this short parenthesis (*vvhich labor vvellãd Zealously also*) Truly, if so fewe Iesuits as are in England, in respect of sommo hundreds of priests that be theare, haue (as this fellow braggeth) conuerted infinitly moe then you all: and haue holpen to saue moe soules then you all, it must needs be a great shame for you all. For, you confesse your selues heere to be very idle and lazy priests. VVhy? what doe you theare? If you be but lookers on, and doe no good? I doo not mervell that so gently you discouer your brethrens pruritie, when you lay your owne shame so willingly

The Iesuits attribut to hem selues the conuersion that is made in Ingl.

The vnited confesse them selues to be lazie.

open to all the world. Yf you haue writtē this Apol. blott it out in the next impreſſion for ſhame, and endeuor to employ your ſelues better in the vocation and miſſion you weare ſent for? or els caſt of your gownes, and gett you a ſpade and mattock in your hands, for you are not woorthy of the vocation you haue. For, is it poſſible that prieſts brought vp in learning, order, and diſcipline, and ſent to labor in ſuch a harueſt, ſhould be ſo idle, that a fewe Ieſuits ſhould ſurpaſſe them in paines and trauaill of gayning Soules, and that by their owne confeſſion? or that they cann without blushing diſcouer their owne drowzie necligence to the world? Yf you haue not written this Apolog. nor diſcouered your ydlenes in action, or ignorance in want of abilitie to gaine and wynn ſoules, then aſke reaſon of this good fellowe that hath borrowed your names, not onely to declaime againſt your brethren, but to calumniat, diſgrace and dishonor your owne ſelues. Or els I will (as you doe theare) requeſt all godly ād pious mynds to ponder and conſider how far Mallice hath blynded you in purſuing your Brethren, in defence of Religious men, that rather then you would hold your peace ād ſay nothing, you are content to diſgrace, and dishonor your owne ſelues.

CHAP. IV.

Fol. 29.
A mã of ſtraw

IN this chapt. You haue putt vp a Man of ſtrawe to fight againſt, repeating with great teadyouſnes, the faction of M. Morgan againſt D. Allen, which appartayneth nothing to this queſtion, but ſerueth onely to fill vp your booke, and to make it bigger. as alſo that of G. G. and Priour Arnold. Yf a man should vrge you, howe you came by their letters that weare ſent ſecreatly betweene frend and frend, I beleeue it would fall out, they weare intercepted, as many a letter is, by ſuch as should haue conſcience to open other mens letters. At leaſt wiſe it is taught to be a caſe of conſcience to doe it. And the world muſt needs deeme that the parſon that hath furnished you with all the letters in this your Apologie, and who hath yet I warrant you a heape for you in ſtore for your larger Apol. hath hadd more care to aſſemble and keepe them, then to ſaie ouer his beades.

Intercepting of letters.

CHAP. V.

FOR their charging the Rector, I dislike all such vndue digressions from the Questiō in controuersie, as I doo you your selues also for reporting the diuers seditions *ad nauseam vsque* that were in the Rom. College, bicause it is nothing to the purpose and question betvvene you and your brethren, which is: whither the Card. Protector vvithout the Popes breue coulde or might constitute a new dignitie in Ingland? and next: vvhither the Priests (that hild and taught he coold not doo it) vveare schismaticks, seditious, and rebellious for the same or no? vvhat appertayneth this to the faction of M. Morgan ād M. Paget against D. Allen, or to the discontentement of our Gentlemen in Flanders against sa. Holt? The question (I say) is: vvhither the Iesuits', Arhp. and you vnited Brethren, haue iustly or vniustly by writing published them disobedient and vvoorse then sooth sayers for not receyving the Archp. vpon the Card. letters? ād vvhither the Archpriest (with vvhome you are vnited in this scandalous action) after their submission vnto him, vpō the comming of the Popes buls,

Dislike vvith the Priests and vvith the vnited.

The questions in controuersie.

did well and charitably to renevve the old wound (vvhich was before by their ſubmiſſion healed) againe or no, in not admitting them to be abſolued, except they did firſt confeſſe and recant the foreſaid ſchiſme: this is the cheife ground of this later contention vvith the Archprieſt and the occaſion of their writing to the Pope, and to the inquiſition to haue their Iudgments (ſeeing the Archprieſt reiected the Iudgement of *Sorbonne*) whither they are *Schiſmaticks* or no? this point you touch not, but make extrauagant diſcourſes vpon factions vvhich were in the world, many a faire yeare before thes Contentions grewe amongſt you. but ſomme thing you muſt ſaie to make your booke the bigger, ād to bleare the eyes of your Reader and content his affectiō. Bicauſe then this chapt. vvith the 2. followving pertaine nothing to the hedd queſtion in controuerſie, but containe onely the repeating and ripping vp of the begyning of the troubles betweene the Prieſts and the Ieſuits, together with Fiſhers examinations, I paſſe them ouer.

VVhy the Prieſts vvrot to the Pope.

Th'vnited doo neuer comme neere the point.

Fol 68. b.

Where you accuſe them to be the firſt that appealed from his Hol. breue, for you ſay: *They vveare the firſt that appealed from it:* you doo them wrong, for they appealed not from the Breue, but from the ſtrange ſeueritie and gouernement of the Archprieſt: who as it ſeemeth by the Articles of their appea-

The Prieſts vvronged.

le, and by his ſtrange anſweres made vnto them, could not vvell tell howe to behaue himſelf in this nevve and vnvſuall dignitie, and Iuriſdiction laid vpon him. All this appeereth by their appeale.

You add: that *ſomme of them are preſumed to be principall dooers in theſe late printed libels.* a great fault I aſſure you. for defending them ſelues and their honor in print. If they had kept them ſelues with in the compaſſe of the controuerſie, neither had they offended, neither coold their writings haue beene called libels. But what iuſtice and equitie is there in you my vnited brethren? you are contented that the Ieſuits vvrite ſcandalous books againſt them (which in deede deſerue the name of libels) and that by your approbation: and yet you thinke it not lawfull for your brethren to defend them ſelues in print againſt ſuch infamous accuſations as are Schiſme, ſedition and Rebellion. why! hovve are you ſo blinded vvith affection, that you diſſalovve that in ſecular Paieſts, which yet you well alovve in Religious men? and are you ſo drovvned with paſſion that you can like of the Ieſuits calling your brethren Schiſmaticks, and worſe then ſoothſayers, and I cannot tell vvhat: and yet miſlike of them for purging thē ſelues from thoſe haynous accuſations, ād complayniug of this vncharitable dealing.

Fol. ibidem.

Iniquitie.

Blind affection.

You might (my Brethren) for Modeſties *Fol. 82.*

sake, haue passed ouer in silence the 6. or 7. *Butteries for* 13. *Priests* (if it vveare true, as all is not ghospell you write in your booke) for respect of their vocation, and not to giue Hereticks occasion of laughture and mocking, surely in the Iudgement of your owne factiō, it is much vnworthie the Modestie and Christian sinceritie and honest dealing that ought to be in the cōfessors of Christ towards their brethren of the same profession and confession you your selues be. but the order of writing, the phrase of the booke it self, vvith the store of leters, and other particularities doo shevve to the ey, that it was vvritten by a Iesuit and not a secular Priest. I could lay downe the first letter of his name if I listed, but it is very easy for euery man to coniecture it. onely this I say: he hath doon you (my vnited brethren) great vvrong, vnder you name, to defame your order and vocation.

Fol. 83.

The vnited vvrouged by th'author of the Apologie.

CHAP. VIII.

By vvqose information, the subordination vvas made?

THE vvhol discourse of the begymming of this chapt. tendeth to shevve, that this subordinatiō that is nowe in Ingland vvas made by the information of Fa. Par. Fa. Baldv. and 2. or 3. other Priests, vvhollie affectioned and ledd by Fa. Par. and as you say, of diuers

Fol. 99.

principall men (naming none) frō Spaigne ād Flāders. All vvhich principall men are vvell knowne to be the deere frēds ād creatures of the Ieſuits. The sōme is: that this ſubordinatiō vvas procured by the Ieſuites, ād that the Ieſuits weare the cheif medlers in this ſubordinatiō, which might be better termed *A ſubornation* of his Hol. making him beleeue, that all vvas iump as they told him. Yf I might aske you this Queſtion? what had thoſe principall men in Spaigne and Flanders more to doo vvith the affaires and gouernement of the Clergie of Ingland, then the Prieſts that reſide and trauell theare? vvhat reaſon is theare, that theſe vnquiet weare not demaunded dvvelling in Ingland, and yet the others dwelling in Spaigne and Flāders muſt be demaunded? you anſvvere: *bicauſe they be ſo ſmall a part of the English Clergie.* I replie, yet for learning, ancientie of Prieſthood, and for the long tyme they haue trauailled in that contrey, not to be reiected. They knevve vvhat gouernement vvas beſt for Ingland better then thoſe Spaniards and Flemings. They *vveare* 13. *nomber*, and vveare to liue vnder that ſubordination: by right then their voyces and conſents vvas rather to be asked, then the voyces of 2. Ieſuits and 2. Prieſts out of Ingland, and not ſubiect to that ſubordination. hovve ſoeuer the matter vvas handled, the Fathers cannot be excuſed for medling in a matter not

Subornation.

A lavvfull queſtion.

Anſvvere.

Replie.

in Fol. 67. b.

The Fathers in excuſable.

Deut.16. appertayning to them, and ſo to haue putt their *falcem in meſſem alienam*, vvhich both in the ſcripture and in the lavve is accompred a great fault. what hadd the Ieſuits to doo to procure the ſecular Prieſts a ſuperior? nothing at all, except (as your brethrē ſay) they vvould play ſure, and haue ſuch a one appointed, as ſhould alvvaies relye vpon them, and gouerne by their appointement and preſcription. Theare is in deede great preſumption of this againſt them, their actions and endeuors in this behalf conſidered. You finde fault with your brethren Prieſts for medling in the troubles of the Rom. Colledge againſt the Fathers: and yet the Fathers committ the ſame fault (or a greater) here, as being the cheif medlers and dealers in the contentions that weare amongſt the ſecular Prieſts. Here a man may iuſtlie turne the catt in the pann, and ſay as you doo in the firſt chap. of you Apologie. *That the medling and dealing of the Fathers in the ſecular Prieſts matters and contentions, hath brought great hurt to Ingland, and is like to bring much more*, if this writing of Apologies by them or for them doo ſtill conntynue: as alſo ſomme diſgrace to the vnited brethren, and no leſſe blemish to the Fathers: ſeeing they be compted and eſteemed rather for ſpirituall and moatified men, then for contentious or ſeditious perſons. and for my part I haue alwaies thought

Preſumption againſt the Fathers.

them to be ſuch, and haue againſt their detractors for ſuch defended them. But yet for all that, wee lawyers ſay: that there is noe rule ſo generall but it hath his exceptiõ. ſo no doubt ſomme theare are in that holie companie. *Marke.* that are too too much giuẽ to pollitick matters, and are as it vveare ouerwhelmed vvith the affaires of the vvorld, and more intentiue to them, then appertayneth to Religions mẽ, or aggreeth vvith their profeſſion. And albeit men vvynck novve, and will not ſee them, yet in the day of Iudgement they vvilbe made knowne to all the vvorld.

Where you ſay: that the Popes *breue did not ſatisfie them, but they begann to ſtagger and doubt, and to diſcuſſe their Superiors commandement,* you abuſe your Readers ãd your ſelues. your Readers, in ſaying they ſtaggered at the Popes breue, doubted and diſcuſſed their ſuperiors commaundement. for they did nothing of all this you aleage, but by your owne cõfeſſion yelded, and obeyed the Popes Breue. you conceale the cauſe why they vvrott to his Hol. and the Inquiſition in Latin, and to the English Catholicks in English. vvhich vvas not as you ſay, for refuſing to obey the breue, but for that the Archprieſt vndiſcreatly renevved the old vvound of ſchiſme (the vvhich you vvil not talke of, and are ſorie that ener it vvas mentioned, as you and all peaceable men may vvell be) in forbidding *Fol.* 104. *b.* *The vnited abuſe their Readers and themſelues.* *Fol.* 115.

them to be abſolued except they confeſſed and recanted the ſaid ſchiſme. the which as it is the cauſe of all theſe contentious bookes, ſo doo you ſtill rove at randame, and will not comme neere the marke to anſvvere thereto. you abuſe your ſelues, for that you confeſſe their voluntarie ſubmiſſion to the Breue. and there you ſett dovvne the Congratulations of Fa, Garnet, the Archpriest and others for the ſame ſubmiſſion. For proof of yourformer ſaying and their ſtaggering, &c. you bring the teſtimony of the reuerend brethren forſooth the 6. aſſiſtaunts nominated by the Fathers as the Archpriest was, and as vnorderly inſtalled as their ſuperior the Archpriest vvas, vvhoſe letters and teſtimonie you doo vſe oſtentimes in your booke, which is not woorth a rush in any indifferent mans Iudgement. nor vvould be receiued in any Tribunal in the vvorld, they being the parties, and knovvne aduerſaries to thoſe againſt vvhome they beare witnes. you may pleaſe your ſelues therevvith and be cõtented to enlarge your booke vvith them as you doo vvith many letters of diuers men, that are knowne to be vvholly affectioned to the Fathers, and to be of their faction (if theſe contentious ſydes and part takings may be called factions) the vvhich men vnpaſſionat, and ſuch as ſtãd indifferent to both parties make little accompt of, and giue leſſe credit

Fol. 146. 147.

The teſtimony of the 6. aſſiſtants not vvoorth a rush.

credit vnto.

You thruſt the ſynne and ſcandall that hath enſued and falne out by this contentiō vpon your Brethren, but I praie you giue him his part, that vvrott the ſcandalous booke (condempned by his Hol. and all the Ieſuits that are out of Ingland) of ſchiſme, and part alſo to thoſe that auᵭhorized it, and ſubſcribed to it. Take part your ſelues alſo not onely for contynunig the ſcandall by your Apologies, but by your ignorant accepting the Archprieſt vpon the Protectors letters. for hadd you ſtood to your Brethren in the iuſt refuſall thereof, theſe ſynnes and ſcandall had not happened. this vvriting and libelling one againſt an other, had neuer beene heard of, as novve it hath to the vvonderfull and vnſpeakeable greif of all your frends and vvell willers.

Fol. 105. b. Upon vvhoſe back the ſcandall of this contention lieth.

I vvonder hovve you dare ſay: that *in both their books they haue ſett dovvne their Reaſons confuſedly and tumultuously, and in no one place diſtinctly and in order*: for in ſaying ſo, you giue your ſelues the lye. For, a little before you ſay, that in one place of their booke, they vvould shevve the conſtitution of the Archprieſt by the Cardinalls letters *to be voyd and of no force by* 21. *Reaſons*. Yf I cann prooue, that they *haue layd* 21. *Reaſons together in one place* of the English booke, and that *by diſtinct nombers*, then are they not ſett dovvne

Fol. 107. b. Th'vnited giue themſelues the ly.

Fol. ibidem. *confuſedly* in both their books, and by conſequent you ſay not true in ſaying: *and in no one place diſtinctly and in order.* yet you ſay: *vvee doo lett paſſe the 21. Reaſons vvhich this Cenſurer layth together by diſtinct nombers.* Fol. 176. b. ergo you giue your ſelues the ly by ſaying: *they haue nott ſett them dovvne in any one place diſtinctly and in order.* And in their latin booke vvritten to the inquiſition (vvhereof you make no mention in this Apol. becauſe it toucheth the point and roveth not at any parſon, and bicauſe it hath in it Fa. Liſters booke, vvhich you are ſorie to thinke of) they haue layd dovvne many Reaſons (not confuſedly but orderly,) vvh[illegible] they did not receiue the Archprieſt vpon the Card. letters vvithout the Popes buls. you anſvvere neither to thoſe 21. nor yet to theſe ſett downe in the latin booke before mentioned. But to theſe Reaſons confuſedly ſett dovvne you ſay you vvill anſvvere. In Gods name. I praie God you anſvvere them not ſo confuſedly and tumultuouſly, as you ſay they are laid dovvne in their books.

Fol. ibidem. It vvas gotten ſay they *by the inſtance of the aduers partie.* Doo they not ſay true? vvho is their aduers partie? By your ovvne confeſſion, the Ieſuits and ſpecially Fathers Parſ. vvas it not gotten at the inſtannce of Fa. Par. Fa. Baldvv. and 3. other Prieſts the Ieſuits creatures? you confeſſe ſomuch

The Prieſts ſay true.

your ſelues. This benig true, haue they not *Fol.99.*
iuſt cauſe to preſume that it vvas gotten *Fol.7. b.*
by vvrong and falſe Information? for what hadd the Ieſuits to deale therein, more then the Capuchins, Dominicans, or any other Religious order? It followveth: *againſt all equitie and Iuſtice.* vvhich they proue by the 21. reaſons, by you mentioned, but not anſvveared, and as I haue proued before, againſt the lawes and Canons, ergo againſt *equitie* and *Iuſtice.* And yet they doo not put dovvne this their ſaying as a Reaſon, but as a *Conſideration.* But vvhy did you not go on, and ſay as they doo: *that this ſuperioritie vvas ſo eſtablished by their aduerſe partie, that the ſuperior ſo by them appointed, muſt needs remaine a punie and inferior to them, &c.* vvhich vvords make a vehement preſumption againſt the Fathers of ſtickling and medling ſo farre in theſe matters nothing at all apertaynenig to them.

But vvhat doo you anſvvere to this Reaſon (if you vvill needs haue it one?) For ſooth, this hath beene euidently prooued to be falſe. viz: *that it vvas not gotten, at the inſtaunce of the aduerſe partie onely.* but I ſay, it vvas prooued by your ſelues a little before to be true, as is to be ſeene in the place alleaged in the margent. Next, you giue a probable anſvvere touching their vvill and *Fol.99.*

knovvlege, but to that they say: it vvas contrarie to all equitie and Instice, you are Mumm, and not a vvord; bicause your conscience tell you, thay said true. so that to the cheifest part of their Reason you haue yelded no answvere, although you vvould make your Reader beleeue, you vvill answveare all their Reasons.

You doo as it vveare controwle their second Reason, both at the begynning and at the end. for they say thus: *Furthermore if their intereſt* (the Iesuits) *vveare not great in this auctoritye vvhy should they be so vnvvilling to procure, or suffer to be procured somme bull or breue for the confirmation thereof, that it might be an absolute and independent auctoritye?* To pardon your nipping of the essentiall vvords of their reason both in the begynninng and in the end, and your adding thereto the vvords vvhich they say not, viz *yf it came from his Hol.* howe answvere you the Reason? Forsooth, *the queſtion and reason is novv answvered, for that a breue is procured.* they talke of cheese, and you answvere chaulke. They aske, why the Iesuits vveare so vnwilling to procure or suffer to be procured a bull for so many monethes as the Card. letters weare in controuersie and doubt? and you answveare: *novve a bull is procured.* they aske of the tyme past, and you answeare of the tyme present. They

Pag. 5.

Fol. 108.

Nipping and adding.

knevve ſo well as you that a bull vvas procured,and ſent before they vvrott this booke. I maruell hovve you dare put dovvne their Reaſons, and anſvvere them (I vvill not ſay ſo confuſedly,but,)ſo childishly.

That vvhich you add:that the *Bull is not much more eſteemed of* them thé Card. letters, you ſay vvithout profe , contrarie to your ſelues, and contrarie alſo to their proteſtation.that vvhich you add alſo,to proue their little eſteeme of the breue (viz: *god knovveth out of vvhat office*) as it is but the words of one, ſo are they not to be drawne in generall to all,and yet that one may haue ſpoken them in a good ſenſe. bicauſe theare be diuers offices out of the vvhich the Popes Buls are procured.but be it that it vvas ill ſpoken of him , yet doo you not for all that anſvveare his Reaſon,but ſett his words dovvne falſely, thereby to make them ſound more adiouslie. thus you ſett them dovvne in a diſtinct lettre: *That they doo not knovve out of vvhat office it vvas procured by Fa. parſons meanes*, vvhereas the paraphraze vpon Fa.parſons letters, ſayth, *vntill the 3. or 4. day after that Fa. pa. had procured* (god knovveth out of vvhat office) *an Apoſtolicall breue, &c.* you haue ſett the vvords downe as ſpoken of all the diſcontented brethren (ſaying they doo not knovve) vvhen they are ſpoken but of one. beſides you ſett them dovvne as ſpoken ſim-

Fol. ibidem. Th'vnited ſpeake vvithout booke.

Fol. ibidem. Pag. 2.

vvords ſett dovvne falslye.

Pag. 82.

plie and abſolutly, vvhereas, they are putt vvithin a parentheſis as ſpoken in paſſing.

Of many Reaſons put together not one anſvvered.

Thirdly, you put many Reaſons together, bicauſe you faime vvould be at your letters againe, and at Fishers examination, and for haſt, you cote not the place vvhere you found them. but vvee muſt beleeue you on your vvord, that haue ſo often deceyued vs in aleaging their vvords. but in Gods name vvee vvill beleeue you this once. The

Fol. 108. firſt. that *the Card. letters patents are not ſufficiant to giue the matter credit*, your eaſy anſvveare: *vvho dooth not knovve, &c.* hath beene anſvvered before, and shevved, that a Card. Protectors vvords and letters for the conſtituting of a nevve dignitie, or conferring of an old, hath no credit in any Chriſtian court in the vvorld, albeit they comme a hundred tymes, vvith Ex ſpeciali mandato Sanctiſſimi. your Canō, lawe, and Gloſſes, haue beene turned againſt you before, and make ſtill againſt you till you doo bring vs better. Secondly that *he hath beene found partiall tovvards the Ieſuits.* this may be true, bicauſe he vvas a man as others are, and allied to the Generall of the Ieſuits as you ſay. The 3. Reaſon. *that he* (the Protector) *is not their lavvfull ſuperior*, as he is not in deede. neither lavvfull nor vulawfull, for he hath no ſuperiortie at all ouer any English man

by that office, as hath beene shewed before.

The 4. Reason. *And the like.* vvhat (I pray you) doo you answere to these 3. last reasons? euen thus. *But not to stand vpon these matters, it is a fovvle thing, vvhen for couering our ovvne vvills of not obaying, vvee seeke holes in the coate and auctoritye of our superiors as these men doo, &c.* *A vvise reason* Fol. 108. b.

You haue well shot and kild a busard. you vvill not stand, bicause indeede you cannot stand against Reason, then sitt a vvhile and compt howe many mo of their Reasons (left vnrehersed and vnanswered) are conteyned vnder your last vvords, *And the like?* that vvee may see them answeared, vvith your answveares to them, in your larger Apologie, in the vvhich as you promys vs more abonndannce of letters, and a larger discours of Fisher and his *examination*, so I feare me vvee shall finde as little reason and matter as vvee haue found in this. *Th'vnited cannot stand, but must be rouing.* Fol. 95.

Well, these discontented brethren doo not onely seeke hoales in the coate of their Superiors the Card. and the Archpriest (the first being neuer their superior, no nor yet, the next vntill his Hol. bull came) *but also in this Holynes* (coate) *but in couert vvords.* But let vs see the hoales made in his Hol. coate and auctoritye? forsooth, *they persvvade the people, that he hath beleeued false information.* A sore matter. but vvhere haue they persvvaded the people thus much? For sooth, *in both books,* *Marke the hoales found in his hol. coate.*

and eſpecially the English, (you ſay in the margent) *and almoſt in euery pag.* but you note no one pag. Well! they make the people beleeue, that his Hol. hath beleeued falſe information. Why may not his Hol. beleeue falſe information? is he not a man as others are? and is he not ſubiect to paſſions, as before hath beene noted? yf he hath beleeued falſe Information, it is not a hole in his cote, but a fowle hoale in their coates and conſciences that gaue ſuch falſe information.

His Hol. may beleeue falſe information, benig falsly informed.

Pag. 35. It followeth: *and thereby appointed a ſubordination moſt inconuenient.* they giue a good reaſon thereof in the English booke. For by this ſubordination gotten by falſe information the Ieſuits *haue the Archprieſt as their punie, and inferior to them, and by conſequence all prieſts muſt be their apprentizes, and ſtand at their command*, and thereby *may keepe the Archp. in awe, that he ſhall dare doe nothing that may diſpleaſe them, for feare they ſhould thruſt him out &c.* and theſe be hoales, not in the Popes, but in the Fathers coates, and ſufficient cauſes of inconueniēce

The reaſō why the ſubordinatiō is incōuenient.

Hoales in the fathers coate.

Next, *And not heard of in the church before.* Tell vs (I pray you) in your larger Apol. ifeuer it was heard of in Chriſtes church before, that an Archp. ſhould be ſuperior to all the prieſts in 2. Realmes, and that his iuriſdiction ſhould extend ſo largely out of the quire ād church, ouer theſe Realmes. When you can

shewe this, then vpbraid them for ſuch ſpeeches: for vntill then, you shewe but your oWne ignorance, in imputing this to them, as an vndue and vnreuerent ſpeach. Thē they ſay: *It is againſt all equitie and iuſtice.* that this Was well and truly ſpoken, hath beene ſufficiently prooued before, and you your ſelues could not anſwere it. It followeth, And *that his Holl. could not lavvfully appoint it vvithout their conſents.* The word *laufully* being taken for that vvhich is doon by lawe. And *vnlavvfully.* for that vvhich is doon againſt lawe, they ſay full true *His Holl. coold not doe it lavvfully:* that is, obſeruing and following the lawes, conſtitutions, canons, and decrees of his predeceſſors, as hath beene shewed before. Laſtly, *And that the meanes by vvhich he had appointed it, is inſufficient, bynding no man no obay it.* All this is true, if there be any truth at all. For as it hath beene proued before at large, a Card. letters are not ſufficiēt to conſtitute a newe dignitie, or to confirme an old. and the meanes weare ſo farre from bynding any man to obay it, that all ſuch as obayed it, are punishable by the canons, as hath beene before declared. Of all theſe truthes cōclude you vvhat you liſt, but I cōclude, that you are by theſe Words ſo farre frō finding many hoales in his Hol. coate, as you cānot thereby finde one hoale at all, the ſame being truly and lawfully ſpokē. And I cā-

Ignorance.

Truthies. Fol. 107. b

not a litle maruell, that you are not ashamed to reherse them, Without making answere thereto, being so euident against you in the question that is in controuersie. It followeth

Fol. 109. *They acknowledge the Archp. and his auctoritie in vvords, yet doe they seeke by all meanes possible to discredit his auctoritie.* They acko-

Pag. 4. *in the preface.* wlege the Archpr. auctoritie in more ample manner and vvords then you doe sett downe

Pag. 3. heere. That is: they acknowlege him since his Hol. bull came. before, they forbare to acknovvlege him, as in the same preface they franckly confesse. But their deeds are contrarie to their vvords. *In vvord they confesse him, in deeds, they discredit his auctoritie.* hovve prooue you this? bicause M. Collington and M. Charnock reported, the Archpriest

Wiselie. *dubbled vvith them*. But vvhen dubbled he with them? before the Popes breue came, the vvhē they did not acknovvledge him either in vvord or deed to be their superior, as they

Pag. 3. confesse in the preface of their English booke. Hovv dooth this prooue they seeke to discredit his auctoritie since the Popes breue came? Your proffes hang by Gimboles, and had neede to be knitt together vvith points.

A deceiptfull obiection. Besides, you vvould deceiue your reader by obiecting that to them novv since the breue came, vvhich vvas lavvfully doon by them before the breue came. Yf then you vvill prooue any thing, you must prooue that in

deeds and facts they haue gone about to diſcredit his auctoritie ſince the breue came. ād your parentheſis (*For of their tvvo relations onely all the matters are raiſed againſt him*) ſeemeth to in ferre, that 2. vvitneſſes although they be prieſts, are not ſufficient teſtimonie to proue any thing in queſtion. you ought to knovve, that the teſtimonie of 2. parſons is ſufficient by the lavve of God and man, but you thinke it an abſurd thing to admitt the teſtimonie of 2. prieſts, and yet you are offended vvith thē (throughout your booke) for that they vvill not credit one parſon, viz, the Card. through vvhoſe relation and letters, all theſe troubles are raiſed, betvveene the ſaid prieſts, the Ieſuits and your ſelues.

You cannnot comprehend hovve theſe things should be ſpoken, that the Archprie. should at the firſt ſay? *His Inſtructions came from Rome.* and yet aftervvards ſay: *they vveare made in Ingland.* you cannot comprehend then hovve a man may be contrarie to him ſelf: or that he may vpon better deliberation, correct that vvhich he had ſaid before. Suerly, your comprehenſion then is verie feeble, if you cānot comprehend thus much. I doe comprehend it vvell, and beleeue it alſo, bicauſe theare are 2. vvitneſſes as you report that affirme it: vvhich are aſvvell to be beleeued in this cauſe, as your reuerend brethren the 6. aſſiſtants are to be beleeued in

their ovvne cauſe.

The next proof is that they giue out *he had ſpoken an hereticall propoſition.* this toucheth the diſcredit of his parſon, and not of his auctoritie a ſore matter. vvhoe knovveth not, that not onely an Archp. (vvhich is the lovveſt dignitie in Gods Church) but an Archbishop alſo (being ſo eminent a dignitie) is not priuileged, but that he may erre, ād that this gifte is not annexed to his office or dignitie, but that he may ſomtymes vtter an hereticall propoſition vvhither this vveare ſaid or no, maketh nothing to that vvhich you haue taken in hand to prooue. viz: that ſince the breue came, ād ſince they acknovvleged him in vvord. *They haue ſought all meanes to diſcredit his auctoritie and parſon in deed.* For theſe vvords vveare ſpoken before the breue came, and before they acknovvleged him to be their ſuperior. Ergo not ſpoken to diſcredit him as their ſuperior, as you vvould make your ſimple reader beleeue.

An Archprieſt may erre.

Fol. 110. *The prieſts vnerdelie ſpeach.*

That which you obiect to them of forraine auctoritie and of the premunire, was (in truth) foolishlie and vnorderlye ſpoken, ād therefore they are iuſtly reprehended of you for the ſame. But the words annexed, viz. that his Hol. cannot doe it lawfully vvithout their conſents &c. as they are not in the 14 pagin. by you noted, and haue beene often tymes by you repeated, ſo are they true and irre-

prehenſible, as in diuers other places, hath before beene shewed.

And although it ſeemeth ſtrange to you, *VVhie* (their books) *vveare no vv printed after the breue is comme foorth, and hath not vvrought that effect for quieting them, vvhich theare they promyſe,* to me, or to any vnpaſſionat and indifferent reader, it ſeemeth not ſtrange at all. Bicauſe the calumnious crime of Schiſme, being renewed againſt them ſince the comming of the bull, for that they did not obay the Archp. vpon the Card. letters, they weare driuen to yeld their reaſons, why they did not receiue him vpon the ſaid Card. letters, and ſo to cleere them ſelues frō that calumnious accuſation of ſchiſme, ād to shewe to the World, that they are much leſſe to be counted ſchiſmaticks, ſince that they yelded to his Hol. bull. The vndiſcreat dealing of the Archp. and his counſellours gaue the occaſion of writing and publishing theſe books, the vvhich they weare bound in conſcience to doe, to conſerue their good name and fame.

Fol. ibidem.

The reasōi vvhy they printed their booke after the cōming of the bull.

See their reaſons in the 2. and 3. Aphoriſme, to the Popes Nuncio in Paris

Well, ſeeing you haue omitted abooue 30. reaſons Which they haue laid downe in their 3. books, and haue choſen certeine ſpeeches onely (naming them reaſons) to anſwere, ād yet haue not ſatisfied to any one of them, I meruell not that you *lett paſſe* (as you ſay) *the 21. reaſons vvhich this cenſurer laieth together*

The vnited haue omitted aboone 30. reaſons, and lett them vnanſvvered.

Fol. 176. b

by diſtinct nouſbers to diſcredit the Protectors letters: ſeeing you cannot anſwer their ſimple ſpeeches.

But you will not lett M. Champeyneyes, Epiſtle eſcape ſo good cheape, you vvill anſwere all his reaſons. The firſt is taken out of S. Thomas who as yon confeſſe, ſaith: That: *The ſubiect muſt knovve the vvill of his Superior, othervviſe he cannot be ſaid truly to diſobay him.* But theſe prieſts did not knovve the vvill of their ſuperiour the Pope, Ergo M. Champeny ſaith true, that they vveare not diſobedient to his Hol. in not admitting the Archp. vpon the Card. letrers. But you replie out of S. Thomas that theare is a ſecreat and a manifeſt commandment. but it vvas a ſecreet commandment of the Pope conteyned in the Card. letters. The which they and I both deny: and hovve ſhall wee knowe it was a ſecreet commandment ? bicauſe the Card. ſaith he did it *Ex expreſſo mandato Sanctiſſimi*, No mã is to beleeue him on his word as hath beene ſufficiently prooued before, ãd by conſequence, not to beleeue that it was the ſecreat commandment of his Hol. Againe his Hol. in the extrauagant *Iniunctæ* dooth expreſlie commaund no man to beleeue or accept of thoſe that cõme vvithout his bul: ergo in ſuch a caſe no ſecreat commandmẽt can be preſumed. and if it vveare, yet not to be credited, againſt an expreſſe commande-

Fol. 110. b
Fol. 111.
M. Champeneys firſt reaſon.
Replie.
Anſvvere.

ment. Our lavve ſaith: *Expreſſa nocent, non expreſſa non nocent.* As it bindeth vnder ſynne to obay, when the Superiors vvill dooth by any meanes appeere, as you ſay out of S. Thomas: ſo it is no ſynne or diſobedyence, vvhen the ſuperiors vvill dooth by no meanes or vvaies appeere, as it dooth not in the caſe of this queſtion. and ſo lett any man conſider vvhither S. Thomas his ſpeach of obedience touch your brethrē or no, as it dooth not in deede.

You haue beene told before that you may be ashamed to call that *A perillous and ſcandalous doctrine about obedience*, as you note in your mergent, and more ashamed to putt a patche or a peace of their ſentence in your text, vvhen it hath beene proued before that it is a true, Chriſtian and Catholick Doctrine.

From M. Champeney you leape backward to your fare you vvell, and are not ashamed to putt his vvords dovvne *for abſurd, perillous, and ſcandalous doctrine*, vvhich is a moſt iuſt and lavvfull doctrine, *not at the firſt ſight to admitt any auctoritie but ſuch as is orderly procured and lavvfully promulgated.* They are vvarranted to ſay ſo, by the fore alleaged Extrauagant *Iniunctæ*, and diuers other places of the Canon and ciuil lawe. Their reaſon annexed you cutt of vvith your accuſtomed &c. your anſvvere is: *But vvho ſhall iudge of* *Fol. 112. b*

A peece of a ſentence.

Haue at, fare you vvell.

&c. Helpeth much the vuited.

this? I anſvvere. his Hol. their ſuperior, to whome in this caſe they are to retire: but not euery ſubiect as you guilefully would make your reader to beleeue they thinke and ſaie: *All that you can alleage out of the fathers of ready prompt and ſimple obedience*, is to be vnderſtood of a true Superior, or vvhen (as S. Thomas ſaith) they knovve the vvill of their Superior.

Your firſt rule nothing vvorth.

Your firſt rule out of Fa. Gregoire hath no place in this controuerſie, bicauſe the manner of conſtituting the Archp. by the Cardin. bare letters, vvas contrarie to the commandement of a higher ſuperiot the Pope, vvho in the foreſaid chap. *Iniunctæ* forbiddeth any prelat to be receiued vvithout he bring the Popes Buls vvith him, for proof that he is conſtituted in thar dignitie. And beſids, the Protector did exceede the limits and povver of a Protector, vvho hath no povver or Iuriſdiction to conſtitut any nevv or old dignitie in Ingland as Protector of the nation. And ſo might you haue put vp this rule in your purſe, bicauſe it maketh quite againſt you. But lett vs ſee the marke you shoote at. *Marke* (quoth you) *that a man is boond to obay in all vvherein he hath not euident knovvlege to the contrarie.* Marke (my Maiſt.) that this marke is a falſe marke. For Fa. Gregorie ſaith no ſuch thing. take your ſpectacles and read him ouer once againe, and ſo it is not *quite oppo-*

Marke a falſe marke.

ſite

fite to your mens doctrine.

The firſt corollarie of fa. Gregorie maketh aſmuch for you as the rule before aleaged: *It is ſufficient to bynd the ſubiect (vnder obediẽce) that he dooth not knovve euidently to the contra rie, to vvitt: that it is either euill, or vvithout the limits of his ſuperiors auctoritie.* Ergo if that vvhich is commaunded be euill, or without the limits of the auctoritie of him that commaundeth, thoſe that refuſe to obey, are not diſobedient to their ſuperiors. Now the thing it ſelf, as the prieſts haue often ſaid and prooued alſo, is euell of it ſelf, next, the Protector that commaunded exceeded the limites of his auctoritie, for he had none at all. by cõſequence then your brethen weare not diſobedient, ãd you haue brought this corollarie to curry your ſelues. *By euidẽcs heere* (quoth he) *I vnderſtand that vvhich shalbe ſo iudged* not by the paſſionat ſubiect, but *by other good and learned men.* But it hath heene iudged by the good and learned men of Sorbonne that they did not ſomuch as ſynne in refuſing the Archpr. vpon the Card. letters, ergo heere is no diſobediẽce. Yea it is iudged by the Pope him ſelf, as hath often beene ſaid, that no man can be inſtalled in any Eccleſiaſticall dignitie, without his buls, Ergo it was euident to the prieſts that the Card. commandement (if he had beene their ſuperior) exceeded the limite of his power and auctoritie, and ſo by the

The firſt corollarie is not for you. Fol. 113.

D. c. Iniunctæ

Q

former rule and corollarie: committed no disobedience against their ſuperiors.

Fol. 113. b The 2. and 3. corollaries make nothing for the vvited.

The ſecond and third corollarie, brought out of the ſame father, make as little againſt them as the former. for he talketh in them of a ſubiect, and ſo preſuppoſeth a man that is ſubiect to an other. But no Englishman is ſubiect to the Protector of Ingland, and therefore it appartayneth not to your brethren, nor prooueth them diſobedient for not obaying the Card. protectors commandment.

That which you add: that the prieſts rune vpon paſſion may be well applied to your ſelues, whome paſſion hath ſo blinded, that you will not or doe not vnderſtand the Author you aleage, when they are ſo farre from being againſt your brethren, that they confirme ād prooue their lawfull endeuors and actions.

Materiall diſobedience.

At laſt you come to materiall diſobedience, *vvhich conſiſteth in omitting that vvhich vvas commaunded, or dooing any thing contrarie thervnto.* viz to the commaundment of his Superior. But the Protector as you muſt ſtill be told (for you vvillinglie forgett it, and yet harp ſtill vpon yt) was not their ſuperior, neither was it euident that it was commaunded by his Hol. and therefore they haue not committed this material diſobedience. I graunt with you that both kinds of diſobedience are damnable in ſuch as commit them, but you neither haue nor can prooue, that your

brethren haue committed either of them, & therefore are not culpable of that damnatiõ.

At length you comme to iudge of their intentions, of their thoughts and cogitations, seeing you can proue no disobediẽce in their words and outward actions. You *vvish it vve are not opẽly seene in this fact of theirs, and their perseuerance therein.* What (I praie you) weare not seene? forsooth, *their intention not to obey*. yf men may expresse their inwards thoughts and intentions by words (for words Weare inuented t' expresse mens inward intẽtions) I will shewe you their intentions, and then lett the reader iudge whither you vtter these vvords with a good intentiõ or no, thus they say in English. *VVee haue and doe vovve all obedience vnto Gods church, and doe acknovvlege and embrace all auctoritie lavvfully proceeding from the Sea Apostolicke, and are most ready to shevve all obedience therevnto,* &c. and elswhere: *vvee protest and vovve all obedience due to Gods church, and to all her lavvfull auctoritie, and therefore can be no schismaticks. If they say: vvee doe not obay this auctoritie (of the Protectors) let them shevve vs that it is a lavvfull act of the church, and vve obay*, howe dare you in conscience reflect so vpon their intentions (hauing read these words) as to indge quite against their intentions'. you should in your booke haue shewed that the institution of the Archp. by the Card. Protectors letters

you iudge of mens thoughth and cogitations falsely. *Fol. 113. b*

Pag. 2.

Pag. 7.

vvhat the vnited should haue doon.

was a lawfull act of the church, and then had you gained the victorie: thē might you in some sort haue compted them (if not schismaticks) yet seditious and rebellious for withstā. ding a lawfull act of the church. But this rock of theirs is so strōg ād immouable, that you dare not thrust at it, but you scatter the sands of discourses, not apparteyning to the matter ād question in your readers eyes, to hinder him from seeing the force and strength of their cause, and the barenes and weakenes of your pretended defence.

Fol. 114. b 115. From reasoning, you turne to charging the consciences of your discontented brethren, at the day of iudgement, to tell you in sinceritie and without passion, whither *the Card. morally vveare not to be beleeued, or vvhither he vvould dare presume to doe or to attempt so publick an act vnder letters patentes: and that expressely in the Popes name vvithout sure cōmission?* They may answere you sincerely and truly as at the day of iudgment, that they might both probably and morally doubt of the Car. credit, weare his letters neuer so patēt, or said he in them to haue neuer so expresse cōmandement of his Hol. as hath beene shewed before in the question: Whither credit is to be giuen to a Card. saying he hath expresse cōmandement from the Pope to doe this or that? where the cōclusion is negatiue, that neither probably nor morally he is to be beleeued.

Question.

Answere.

and thither I referre you.

The fine faultes you finde in their informacion sent to the DD. of Sorbonne, are suplied and put in the case proposed by me in the beginning of this pāphlet. but to say something to thē as they ly in your booke. The first faut you say is: bicause *they added not, that he vvas protector of the natiō*. Which is in deede a fault in you to thinke, that that wold haue chāged the case, and made the DD. not to haue pronounced as they did. As who should say: he being the Protector had more power and auctoritie ouer our nation, thē being a bare Car. and not Protector. Euery Card. in Rome hath as much auctoritie and iurisdiction ouer vs as hath the Protector. For as I haue often told you, he hath none at all. The second they said *he did it according to the vvill and good liking of the Pope*. And you would haue them haue sayd it was *Expresso mandato*, by expresse commandement. Is not his will and good liking conteyned in this expresse commandemēt? or is not his expresse commandment his will and good liking? The 3. fault is of as small waight, bicause no such subordination could be made without his Hol. breue (vvhich is the thing in question) You 4. is folish in finding fault with them for saying *Many*. why may not 13. *persōs* be called *Many parsons*? yf they might say in latin *mnlti*, why not in Engl. *many*? Fiftly they say: that they *refused onely to subscribe till he*

Fol. 116. Of the v faults found in the information sent to the DD. of Sorbonne.

the first is of no importaunce.

The second is no fault.

The 3. of small vvaight.

The 4. is foolish. Fol. 67. b

The 5. is vvithout fault.

had obteyned letters from the Sea Apoſtolick. and this was true. howe ſay you was it not? did they not ſtill perſiſt in their refuſall till the breue came: what fault finde you with this information? when you your ſelues in many places of your booke affirme it to be true? ād for their ſo reſiſting weare accōpted ſchiſmaticks and ſo are ſtill for the ſame reſiſtaūce. you add: *as vvho vvold ſay, that this being doō they meāt to be quiet.* theare being quiet or not quiet afterwards dooth not change the caſe propoſed to the Sorbonniſts. *and as though* (you ſay) *in the meane ſpeace they had behaued them ſelues obediently.* To whome (I praie you) ſhould they haue behaued thē ſelues obediētly? to the Archp. whome they iuſtly and lawfulli denied to be their ſuperior, ād rightly reiected him as an intruded parſon? as one that came in at the windowe? yea but ſay you) *no man vvas theare preſent of the ſuperiors ſide to informe the good Doctors.* yf any hadd beene preſent, ād coold haue ſaid no more then you haue ſaid heere, the good DD. wonld haue ſaid as they did. for this which you haue aleaged, altereth not the caſe propoſed at all either in ſubſtance or circunſtance of any valeur or reſpect. You accuſe them for breaking out againe after the ſight of the Popes breue, but you tell not why, neither put you downe the cauſe as they doe, ād Why? bicauſe you defend an vniuſt and ſcādalous cauſe. They ſay it was, for that the Arch. after their reconciliation to him, did renewe

Obiection.
Anſvvere.

Fol. 118.
The vnited deale not ſyncerely.
Vvhy the prieſts did breake from the Archp. after the comming of the Breue?

the old teare of ſchiſme, and hild them for ſchiſmaticks for not admitting and receiuing him vpon the Car.letters.thus they ſay in many places of their Engl.booke,ād in their latin booke writtsn to his Holl. they ſet downe M.Blackvv.letter forbidding any prieſt to admitt them to confeſſion,or giue them abſolution except they acknowlege them ſelues for ſchiſmatickes:in their latin booke to the inquiſitiō after they had mentioned the peace that enſued vpon the coming of his Hol. breue,and of the congratulation of the Archp.& Ieſuit,ād ſpecially of fa.Parſ. they add: that one *Rob.Iones a Ieſuit did raiſe vp againe fa.liſters opinion that thny vveare ſchiſmat. vvhich Iones tanght and preached that all that did not hold then for ſchiſmat,did encurre the Cenſures of the church.* Now the Arch. quoth they did not onely approue Iones his teaching but did alſo publish euerywhere the reſolution before ſpecified viz:that they were ſchiſmatickes, & weare not to be abſolued except they recanted. thus they lay dovvne to the wholl vvorld the cauſe of their writing and appealing from the Arc.you finde fault vvhich thē for it, but yet you neither refute that with they ſaie, nor giue any other probable cauſe of this reuolt and contention.To vvhat end vvrott you this booke?not to refute your aduerſaries reaſons not to reprehend them for laying dovvne a falſe cauſe of theſe contentions? no truly, for you doe neither the one nor the other.but ra-

Pag.63.

Pag.59.60.

Fa.Iones.

The Arehp.indiſcretion.

The vnited doe not refute this cauſe,nor giue any other.

The ſubſtaunce of their Apol.

rather to discourse of old dissentiõs in Rome Paris & Flanders, in laying dovvne loades of letters to no end or purpose. ād this is the very substāce of this your breif Apol. that which you add: they bring against the newe breue, hath beene answeared before.

Fol. 118. Lastly, you charge your brethren being *not* scarse 10. against 300, howe they durst make so dangerous a diuision? they may answere that this dangerous diuision proceeded from those 3. or 4. at Rome, that gaue the informatiõ & counsell to haue an Arch. without asking the consent of the priests in Ingl. and their procuring him to be so disorderly and vnlavvfully constituted: and not frõ those priests, that according to the decrees of the church, yea by the expresse commandment of the holie Canons refused a prelat so disorderly and vncanonically thrust and put vpon thē as it vveare by violence, against the expresse lawe and approoued custome of Christs church. Fot my part I much maruell hovv you can in conscie-ce an hovve you dare for shame put the cause of this diuision vpon them: vvhē as they in all their booke giue solid and lavvfull reasons of their dooings, lay the occasiõs vpõ the Iesuits and Arch. ād yet you neither answere their reasõs, nor defēd the others frõ the blame put vpon them: neither doe you obiect any reasonable cause against thē vvhereby a man may see or coniecture that they vvere the authors and begynners of this diuisiõ & cõtēsion. And

The vnited may be ashameth, to put the cause of this diuision vpon the priests.

yet forsooth they are the authors they made this diuision, I talke not of those dissentions that fell out at Wisbith, but of those newe controuersies, the cause of all these scãdalous cõtẽtiõs, ãd vncharitable vvriting one against an other. viz: the subordination and the renewing of the quarrell of schisme. whereof they shewe and prooue the Iesuits ãd Archpriest to haue beene the Authors. and you doo not cleere and deliuer them from these accusations. this you should haue doon, and this should haue beene the scope of your booke, if you meaned to haue doon any thing that Good is. the fault (so farre as I cann parceiue) lyeth yet vpon their shoulders, for any thing that you cann saie in this your Apol. to the contrarie. I knovve not howe you vvill handle the matter in your promised larger Apologie.

vvhat the vnited shoold haue doon in their Apologie.

If *little releif commeth to your brethren* (as you say) *by this definition of Paris*: what needed the Archpriest to make this seuere edict against it, as it is put downe in your brethrens appeale: *that neither directly nor indirectly they mainteine or defend in vvord or in vvriting the censure of the vniuersitie of Paris, &c.* belike it made for them, as in deede it dooth still not vvith standing your 5. additions that you would should haue beene added vnto it. For these circunstãces and considerations neither do *aggrauat* as you would make men beleeue, nor at all change the state of the case or

Fol. 118. *b.* *Pag.* 110.

Th' edict of Paris maketh for the Priests.

Fol. 116. *b.* & 117.

queſtion propoſed. and ſo th'Academicall ſentence ſtandeth firme ſtill and maketh ſubſtantially for M. Champeney without florish or oſtentation.

Fol.119. *Wee haue shevved* (quoth you) *in the former chapt. vvith hovve little reaſon our diſcontented brethren being ſo fevve and ſuch as they vvere* (Serving men, Soldiers, and wanderers) *oppoſed thẽſelues at the begynning to the firſt Inſtitution of this Hierarchie, &c.* beleeue you vvho liſt. this is a florish in deede with oſtentation of an vnited fitton. where haue you shevved it? note the place leafe, and lyne. ſure I am you haue reported, that they haue layde downe 21. Reaſons againſt that Inſtitution, but that you haue anſvvered any one of them, as yet I finde not. you haue heere and there picked certaine ſpeeches out of their books, but hovv poorely you haue anſwered them, I leaue to the Readers Iudgement, that will but caſt his eyes vpon the ſame places, and yet vvee muſt beleeue you bicauſe you are a nomber, that you *haue shevved vvith hovve little reaſon your brethren oppoſed them ſelues to the inſtitution* of the Archprieſt. You may well play which the noſes of boyes, vvomen, and your owne creatures, but in different men pitty your caſe and laugh at your ſo vaine affirming that which you neuer did. *Shevve hovve little Reaſon* (quoth you) mary he that hath read the former chapt. and will beleeue you, hath in deed but little Reaſon. Theſe be gugawes

Fol 29.b.

And vnited fitton.

Th' vnited play vvith mens noſes.

and toyes to mock at or to pleaſe foles, and not vvorthy ſuch graue men as you are or ought to be, aud ſuch conſtant Confeſſors. What! make you no conſcience (ſauing your reuerence) to fitton and that in print? hovve doo you abuſe ād detract them behind their backes, that dare in print ſay: you *haue shevved hovve little reaſon* they had? hauing not anſvvered to any one of their Reaſons as yet. You add, *ordayned by his Hol.* this you should prooue. This is the Queſtion. vvhither at the begynning he vvas ordayned by his Hol. or no? they ſay no. and bring abooue 30. Reaſons to proue their aſſertion. But you ſay often yea, and for prooffes and reaſons, you giue vs nought but bare vvords. vvho is then bound to beleeue you?

VVhat the vnited should prooue.

As they asked you before, *vvhy in ſo many Monèthes ſpace the bull* was not procured? ſo you aske them heere: *vvhy they ſent not a lettre to Rome either to his Hol. him ſelf or to his Nephevv, or to any other acquaintannce of theirs there?* And as you anſwered them (but howe Iump iudge you) *bicauſe it is novv anſvvered for that the breue was procured*, ſo ſay I: they weare not bound to ſend either Meſſenger or lettre either to his Hol. or his Nephevv, or to any other acquanitannce *to knovve vvhither this matter came from his Hol. or no: or vvhither the Protector had abuſed the Popes name or no?* bicauſe it was anſvvered by the Pope long ſince that none vnder paine of depriuation of the frui-

Fol. 108. *Fol.* 119. *b. Queſtion.*

Anſvvere.

D.c. Iniunctæ.

tes of their benefice should receiue any man to any office benefice or dignitie vvithout he brought the Popes buls. Novve vvee haue a rule that saith (*Qui certus est amplius certiorari non debet. he that is alreadly acertyned of a thing ought not to be certified againe.*) They vveare certified by Pope Boniface, not to admit any such: to what purpose then should they send to his Hol. to be certified againe? And if they had sent and that his Hol. had certified them that it vvas his will, yet could they not in cosience haue received and obeyed him as their superior, bicause he vvas not canonically instituted, being instituted without his Hol. buls, and by him that had no auctoritye to doo it, albeit he had had a hundred expresse commandementes from his Hol. *quia sublata forma, tollitur res.* it is of the forme and essence of a canonicall institution to be instituted by his Hol. buls, if the Collation (as in this case) partaine to him. but this forme was not obserued, ergo the institution vvas not canonicall, and by consequence if they had receiued a hundred letters from Rome, that all vvas doon by his Hol. Good will liking and consent, they had neuer beene the better for it, neither yet discharged in conscience, for acknovvleging and admitting an intruded person that entred in by the vvyndovve and not by the dore, but vnorderly. that is, without his Hol. Bulls.

L. 1. § fin. in fin. ff. de act. empt.

A fond obiectiō often repeated often answvered.

Hovv oft commeth in this fond obiectiō

affirming that the Pope could not doo it vvithout them except he violated the church Canons. sithens it is an infaillable truth, and yet this you lay still downe as an absurd saying, so blinded you are in affection. howe say yow? th'ordinary meanes that heaue alwaies beene in Gods church to appoiot Eccleſiaſticall ſuperiors, vvas it not by election? Runne ouer the titles *De Electione.* and therefore the Pope follovving the ordinary meanes and waies of the church Canons, could not giue them a ſuperior without their conſents. For in matter of election this is the rule: *Plus obeſt contemptus vnius quam contradictio multorum. the contempt of one that hath a voyce in election dooth more hurt, then the contradiction of many.* Wherefore, if theſe fevve 10. Prieſts had beene contemned and all the 300. Prieſts had conſented, the election had beene of no valure. howe then cann it be ſaid, that he vvas ordinaryly inſtituted, and according to the Canons of the Church? vvhen both the 300. and theſe 10. alſo vveare contempned, and their voyces neclected? I ſpeake of the ordinary waie, and ſo doo they vnderſtand (els vvould they not haue made mention of the Canons) not of the Popes plenitude of povver and auctoritye, by vvhich he may take awaie all Election, and alter and change all the churches canons, ād conſtitutions, and make newe in their places, but by the ordinary vvaie of Canon lawe, as they ſay well, the Pope cannot appoint a ſu-

C. Bonæ memoriæ 2. in fin. Ext. de elect.

Follie and ignorance.

perior vvithout the consent of the subiects, vvhich are to liue vnder that superior. I muse at your follie or ignorannce to obiect to them this, and that so often as a great ouersight fault and cõtempt: the vvhich (as I said) is truth it self, sound and canonicall doctrine.

CHAP. IX.

TOuching the imprisonnemẽt of the 2. Priests in Rome, of the vvhich all the 9. chapt. almost dooth treat, I haue put dovvne my Iudgemẽt beforé. onely this I add: that all the principall men vvhome you notifie to haue vvritten against them, vveare such men as all the vvorld knoweth to be in this cause too too much affected to the Fathers, and by affection vtterly blinded in the state and question of the Controuersie, that is betvveene the Priests novv, and the Archpriest and Iesuits. I knovve them all both by face and affection, and therefore may be the bolder to say it.

Affection of blindeth men.

D. Stapleton proueth not your intention.

The first man you name is M. D. Stapleton *vvhome his Hol. purposed to preferre to higher dignitie.* if he vvere nowe aliue he vvould tell another tale against those that hindred him

from that higher dignitie, and that told him a tale in his eare, when he vvas ready to put his foote into his litter and made him ſtaie at home, and looſe that *higher dignitie.* the ſtorie (of like) if you contynue your Apologies vvill comme out one day. Well! but vvhat ſayth D. Stapleton to the matter? dooth he exhort or deſire his Hol. to chaſtiſe by impriſonnement Theſe tvvo Prieſts? *Nihil minus.* He neuer dreamed of it, and yet is he made the foreman af the queſt to condemne them, beinge dead himſelfe by your ovvne confeſſion before the Prieſts came to Rome. What kinde of vvritinge is this to ſaie that a dead man gaue his verdite after he vvas buryed? And vvhy? *becauſe* (vvhen he vvas ſenceles) *he agreed in ſenſe and Iudgement vvith other principall men that vvrot* (after his death) *to Rome.*

He vvas bereaued of his higher dignity.

A dead man fore man of the queſt. Fol. 173. b.

Next to the fore man of the queſt that gaue his verdite after his death ther march *ſeventeene hands of the principall of ovvr Nation in Flanders,* When wrote they? *ſome monethes before they* (the Prieſts) *came out of Englande.* But to whom vvrote they? I praye you? forſouth to the generall of the Ieſuits, the head of thoſe, againſt vvhom the Prieſts vvere in cōtention. But vvhat doe they deſyre? Impriſonement? Nothinge leſſe. *onelye to doe Juſtice, and ſo to make peace.* A Iuſt and reaſonable requeſt. I ſee not to what end you put dovvne a peece of their lettre here. Who would not

The 17. principall men of ovvr Nation did not require their impriſonement.

requeſt Iuſtice to be done? Why? did not the Prieſts them ſelues goe to Rome to aske Iuſtice? that is: If they were founde faultye: to be punished: If innocent? to haue their Iuſt requeſts graunted. Doe theſe 17. principall men requeſt the generall to get them Impriſoned before they were heard? No. Neyther if they had requeſted it (I deeme) should they haue bene heard. Howſoeuer he was afterwards brought by one mans perſuaſion to conſent thereto. for I thinke Fa. Parſons durſt not haue gone with the Popes Officer to apprehended them, ād to impriſone them in the Colledge without the Generall his knowledge and Conſent. And ſo by this meanes the Generall hath his part alſo in this vniuſt and vnæquitable action of their impriſonement, before they were heard, For beſydes his conſentinge to their apprehenſion by permitting one of his order to be preſent and cheife actor in it, this memoriall of theſe 17. ſent to him, was alſo by him to be preſented to the Pope as you inſinuate.

Fol. 124. *b.* After this, followe the letters of the *Zealous men*, the former were *principall men*, theſe are but zealous, although it be the preſident and the Doctors of the ſeminarye. In my tyme, ſuch men were counted amongſt the principall of owr Nation but it was then, when they were their owne maiſters, not ſubiect and pinned to others, and directed by others,

others, as they are nowve, the more is the pitye, and it is the great hinderance of doinge good in owr Countrey. But to vvhom vvrote these zealous men? forsooth to the protector. and not to his holynes? And vvhat do they requeſt? to haue them impriſoned before they vvere heard? (for therein conſiſteth the iniurye and the Indignitye of the fact.) not a vvord thereof. onely they thinke it good, *that ſome example of ſevere correction ſhould be vſed vpon them, to hold others in dutye.* Fol. 125. Nowve if theſe three Doctors vvhich are yet livinge and ſubſcribed to that lettere vvere examined on their Conſciences, vvhether they meant theſe Prieſts ſhould be impriſoned before they vvere heard, or that they meant to haue thē punished, being found factious, and comming vvith no matter of importance, but onelye to trouble his holynes: I am aſſured they vvould anſvvere, they meant not the firſt, for tvvo of them being Doctors of lavve ſhould othervvyſe ſpeake againſt their ovvne knovvledge skyll and practyſe. And ſome of thē I beleeue haue bitten their fingers ſince, for ſubſcribinge againſt their will, to pleaſe and Content others. Well then theſe foure zealous Doctors though not before, yet nowe counted amongſt the *principall men of ovvr Clergie* proue but litle your Intention. Fol. ibidem b.

The preſident and his three Doctors deſyre not their impriſonment.

In the fourth place is ſet dovvne a letter,

D. Worthington nowe president desyred not their imprisonement.

(M. President) wherein he iudgeth them to be *repressed with some severitye*? ergo saie these men, he wrote to haue them imprisoned, before they were heard what they had to saie, or to impart and vtter what they came for, comming as appellannts to the see Apostolique. this they saie, or els they saie nothing. and for profe thereof they haue printed the letter. I am assured that that was not his meaning, what soeuer els he meant by *severitye*. But by these my notes he may see, howmuch he and others were deceived that thought them Culpable and seditious, because they withstoode the Archpriest, so vnlawfullye and disorderlye set vp, by the Protectors letters. as also his predecessor with his 3. Doctors that Confessed this subordination to be most wiselye and wholsomelye instituted. I speake not against the subordination, neither do I misslyke of it, but of the maner of instituting of it at the first, which was against all lawe and reason, as those zealous Doctors might haue seene, if they had but turned ouer their Common lawe.

The names of 3. Doctors abused or borrowed.

After your letter, there are 3. Doctors brought in, and albeit they saie nothing, yet we must beleeue, that they *wrot most earneslye and grauely to the same effect. although* (as I haue said) they said neuer a word *to the same effect*. What! to be imprisoned before they

vvere heard vvhat they had to ſaid, to iuſtifye their comming to Rome? I anſweare, if I vveare with ſome of thē, they vvould ſaie, that you abuſe their names and credit, to make men beleeue they vvere ſo vniuſt, cruell, and vncharitable men, as to vvyshe the impriſonement of innocent men. For vntill they be Iudiciallye conuinced of ſome crime or fault, they are preſumed innocent, as before I haue proued.

In the end you ſett dovvne M. *Licentiat VVrigts* (my old and deare frends) letter. Who albeit he ſpeaketh as a zealous frend of the Fathers, as he euer hath beene ſince I haue knowne him, yet not a vvord in the lettere of the tvvo Prieſts at all, nor of punishing them, much leſſe of requeſting them to be impriſoned before the vvere heard. By all theſe letters I ſee no iuſt cauſe, vvhy the Protector ſhould incite the Pope, or his holynes be moued iuſtlye to reſolue to reſtrayne thē (as you ſaye) or to impriſon them (as they ſaie) at their arrivall or ſome 20. dayes after, being as yet neyther heard nor examined vvhat they brought or had to ſaie. Surelye vvhether Fa. Parſons procured theſe letters or no, theſe letters do not diſcharge him frō their accuſation, that he vvas the cheife procurer of their impriſonement (I doe not ſaie he vvas) but I ſaie theſe letters which ſpeake never a vvord of their impriſonement is not

No vvord at all in M. Licentiat VVrights letter of the tvvo Prieſts.

Fol. 127.

Theſe letters do not diſcharge Fa. Par.

a ſufficient argument (as the thinke) to diſcharge Fa. Par. of the ſuſpition they haue of him.

Fol. 136. At lenghe after your long trauayle in ſetting dovvne letters that make nothing to your purpoſe, in vvrangling vvith your aduerſaries, and not anſvvearing their reaſons: in talking of factions in Paris and Flannders and of the laſt troubles in the Romaine Colledge, after all theſe great travailes (I ſaie) you begin to make your ſelfe merrye, and to enriche your Apologie vvith M. Watſons common vvealth. and hauing firſt diſgraced him for not being *a ſcholler of the Colledge for a good vvhile, but a ſeruant to make M. Boaſts* bed and dreſſe vp his chãber. If this be a diſgrace vnto him to haue bene a poore ſcholler in the Seminarie, then is it not onely a diſgrace to ſome of the ſubſcribers of the former letters, vvhich yet you ſaie to haue bene the principalleſt men of our Natiõ, but to a great number of your ſelues (my vnited bretheren) and to ſome of the Fathers alſo in England, that haue bene alſo poore ſchollers and ſeruants before they vvere ſchollers of the Colledge. If you vrge me in your next I will name the noman knowing the better then I, as having liued manie a yeare in the ſeminarie, yea euen from the firſt ſetting vp of it. A poore ſcholler is a principall man vvhen you liſt if he hold with the Ieſuits: but if he be againſt

Mr. VVatſon diſgraced for being a poore ſcholler.

Manie of you vnited Prieſts, ſome Ieſuits, and ſome of them vvhom you call the principalleſt men, vvere poore ſchollers in the ſeminarie.

them, then it shal be laid in his dishe I vvarrant you. What man having anie Iudgment cann think, that vnited Priests vvrot this Apologie? Hovv can they vvith honeslye and conscience obiect to another as a disgrace and in contempt the state vvherein diuers of them also liued. If it were abiect, and M. Watson to be counted abiect therefore, yet the same Iudgmét is to be giuen of a great number of you your selues, that liued also in that estate, except by holding with the Fathers you are *restituti in integrũ*, vvashed cleane frõ that spot, the others still remaining all to be smyred thervvith. But vvhy (I praie you) might not M. Watson a secular Priest, make a common vvealth for Eccleſiasticall gouernement, so well as a Religious man (as it is reported) make a common vvealth hovv England shalbe gouerned both in Eccleſiasticall and temperal matters. vvhat priuiledge hath this man mote then the other? the vvhich (if it vvere put in print) perhapps vvould make the reader as merrye as this doth. But you haue set it downe at large in recompence of the setting dovvne af Fa. Listers booke, *ad longũ sine require.* I would to god his booke had done no more hurt then M. Watsons common wealth. For this maketh men merrye, that maketh men grone, this stirreth vp laughter, that breedeth melancholy. this reioyceth the readers hart after the reading of so manie te-

VVant of honestie and conscience.

A question to be answeared.

A comparison betvveene Fa. L. Booke and M. VVatsons common vvealth if that be his vvhich the auctor of the Apologye Fathereth vpon him.

dious and vndeacent letters ād matters that maketh manie a man bleede at the verie hart throughe greife and ſorow. this derogateth but a little the credit of a ordinarye Prieſt but that doth blemish not onelye the name and fame of the writer, hertofore held for a verie pious, modeſt and a great learned man: but ſomvvhat alſo of the ſocietie it ſelfe. I knowe manie a Father in theſe coaſts, that byte the lipp, ſo ſoone as they heare anie mentiō made therof. And you yourſelues that vvill not talke of it, but are ſoerye that euer it vvas mentioned, for the greife you haue conceiued of it, cann yet make your ſelues merrie vvith M. Watſons common vvealth. Certes your vocation and grauitye might haue aduertiſed you to haue ſpent your tyme better then in theſe follyes, and to haue ſtudied to anſvveare your aduerſaries Reaſons and argumentes and to haue filled vp your booke vvith ſound Reaſons, rather then vvith theſe flymflams. But vvhy do I ſpeake to you, whē I knovv you are not the Authors, he hath diſcouered himſelfe (as vvyſe as he thinketh himſelfe to be) as in place you maie vnderſtande *Bonus quandoque dormitat Homerus*, even ſo in this booke he hath ouershot himſelfe, and diſcharged you of all blame, but onely of lending your names vvillinglye to the diſgrace, contempt and abaſement of your order ād vocation, as I haue often warned you. If this

vayne of vvryting goforvvard as it hath begun, credit me there are tales and ſtories in ſtore, that will make ſome men blush (if they haue anie blood in their bodie) vvhen they ſhall be ſet out in print. Maie I not for theſe your follyes better crye out then you doo. *Manie merrye tales are kept in ſtore.*

Good lord, to vvhat vanitye are theſe owr vnited brethren grovvne by contention that they cann loſe their tyme in filling their booke vp with theſe toyes! vvheere is the ſpirit of charitye? vvhere is the vertue of modeſtie become? is this fit for deſigned Martyrs, or for good Confeſſors? to diſgrace and deface a man of their ovvne coate and vocation, to make him a mocking ſtock to the readers without iuſt occation: his vvords ād vvritings nothing at all appertayning to the matter inqueſtion? But dravvne as it vvere vvith a cart rope to make your ſelues merrie? one daie you vvill anſvveare for this Idle tyme ſo ſcandalouſlye ſpent. Doe you deſigned Martyrs giue your sheepe ſuch edification? Doo you good confeſſors inſtruct your flocke vvith ſuch ſtuffe and exhortations? hath contention and malice ſo blinded you, that you forget the honorable ſtate and vocatiou you are in? Yes truelye, els vvould you neuer commit the abſurdityes you doo, and eſpetiallye about the cōtempte of men of your ovvne coate and vocation, Amend, amend it is highe tyme. Who I praie you ſent the common vvealth vnto Rome to be Cōmunicated to the Cardinalls that laughed ſo hartilie at it? who tranſlated *Fol.* 138. *Fol.* 139.

it into Italien or Latin, or vvho did explicat it to the Cardinalls to make them so merrye? (for I suppose it vvas written in English for anie thing I can perceiue in this Apologie to the Contrarye.) vvho but the Author and vvriter of this Apologie, to vvhō it vvas sent from England to Rome. Me thinkes I see hovv he laughed whē first he did read it. And then hovv he hasted to Communicate the same to the said Cardinalls to make them merrye, and then vvhat discourses there vvere of the insufficientie, vnlearnednes, and ambitiō of these Priests that stood against the Archp. because this commō wealth maker vvas one of them. *vanitas vanitatum* that Religious men vvho should spend their tyme in studie and contemplation, do take their greatest pleasure, delite, and contentement in vvriting ād receiving packets of nevves from all coasts ād cuntreyes, making that their vvhole studie ād trauaile. Would to god they would cōtent thēselues vvith such packets as are directed to thē, ād not forestalle, and take vp, other mens that appertayne not vnto them.

VVhich side broke the peace after the comming of the bull.

We are come at last to the *Question that standeth in this vvhich part hath broken the peace*, that vvas made by the comming and sigth of his Holines bull. You saie they did *by a nevv deuise they shortlye after cast out, that satisfaction must be made to them for some former hard speaches vsed and vvrytten against them in the tyme of contention, &c.* this you saie but doo

not tell vvho began, vvhich vvaie, in vvhat place and at vvhat tyme and this you proue onelye by *cui bono*. They saie the breach began on the Archp. his side when they had forgiuen and forgotte all the foresaide hard speaches and iniuries done vnto them (so farre were they from requiring satisfactiō for the) ād this they proue in both their Latin booke, by putting downe the Arch. letters, vherein he saith he had receiued from the mother citie a resolution that the detractors of the protectors authoritie were schismatickes, and that he would not absolue anie that made not a conscience of it. Beside they put downe a forme of recantacion or satisfaction which is to be made by such as held against his institution before they could be absolued. These are better and more substantialle proofes then, *cui bono*, that this pitious breache began on the Archpriests side, and not on your discontented brethrens syde. the vvhich I beleeue to be true, because you answeare not one word therto in this Apologie, neither goe you about to cleare the Archp. of it. For this being the cheefe cause they pretend of this contention, and affirminge so oft as they doe that the Archp. renewed the old quarrel of schisme, in all wyse mens iudgment you should haue spent your labour in proouing the contrarie and in discharging the Archp. from this fowle fault. the tyme, (I saie) inke, and paper spent in setting downe M. Watsons com-

Pag. 65. in the one and 60. in the other.

Pag. 120.

This breache crediblie beg: on the Archpr. syde.

mon wealth, had bene much better imployed in controling your aduerſaries of an vntruth, by laying the breach of the peace vniuſtlye vpon the Archp. and his coũſellours but *fortis eſt veritas*, the truth carrieth ſuch a maieſtie with it, that the verie aduerſaries them ſelues dare not approche it, much leſſe impugne it. And to prooue they broke the peace made after the comming of the breue you alledge an Appeale made by 3. of thoſe prieſts from the Archprieſt before the comming of the ſaid breue. Wiſelye, but yet according to your cuſtome throughout your booke, where you put ſtill *quid pro quo*, and the cart before the horſe. The queſtion is, Who brake the peace after the comming of the breue? And you prooue they brake it, bicauſe ſome of them appealed before the breue came downe.

The vnited put ſtil quid pro quo

Fol. 154. Where you obiect the one was made a doctor of Diuinitie, and the other a Bachelerin Paris, againſt an expreſſe Breue that forbad the ſame in all Englishmen. I maruell that this Author the procurer of that Breue is ſo forgetfull, as to ſaie, it is forbidden to all Englismen to take the degree of a Bacheler, where as Doctorship is onelye forbidden. You maie correct the fault in your next, as that alſo, in calling the Appeale made by M. Charnocke verie ridiculous, for he proued in his letter to the Cardinall Burgheſius which is put dovvne in their booke to the inquiſition and that

Fol. ibi. in mar. Pag. 91.

authoritie of the learnedſt Canoniſts, that it vvas a lavvfull and not a ridiculous appeale. you should haue anſvveared his auctorityes, and them haue termed it ridiculous. But leauing his authors vntoucht you shevve your ſelues to be verie ridiculous people, that would haue men beleeue you vpon your bare vvords, and not beleeue thoſe that bring good ſtuffe and authorities for them.

Touching *the ſpeciall point* (you ſaie) *to be noted that they haue not procured anie one of their Appeales to be preſented or proſecuted in Rome.* the note is eaſily to be anſvveared, becauſe the place is not *tutus* ſure for them, hauing experimented it firſt in ther meſſengers, and next hauing Fat. Parſons in the tovvne, vvhom you confeſſe they take to be their cheefeſt aduerſarie, and vvho for his creditt (you ſaie) in the Romaine court dooth great lye lett and hinder their deſignemens. ād this their ſaying vvas not manie monethes ſince confirmed by one of his ovvne coate paſſing by this vvaie, vvho ſaid: ſa. Parſons could doe vvhat he vvould vvith the Pope. Iudge if ſuch a place be ſure for your brethren to perſecute their appeale. And vvhere you adde, that they ought to haue proſecuted it vvithin certaine monethes, vnder payne that all is voyd if it be not doon: you talke like diuynes and not lyke lavviers, as I haue shevved els vvhere before.

Fol. 159.*b* *VVhy the prieſt did not proſecute their apealer.*

Fol. 137.

Fol. 160. And vvhere you saie that *the Archpri. himselfe presented their appellation to his Hollines.* If he haue presentēd that appeale vvhich they have put in the end of their Latyn bookes Certes, either the appellants are egregious. lyers and shamels men, or els the Atchp. had a brasen face: they shameles to exhibit to his Holynes, and to all the vvorld such faulsityes and vntruthes against their lavvfull superior: but if they be truthes and not forged, then had the Archp. a brasen face to exhibit or cause to be presented to his Holines such true, but yet vnvvorthye stuffe against him selfe.

Fol. ibidem. The cause vvhy the priests printed their bookes. If they had kept themselues vvith in the compasse of their matter, the booke vvritten after the appeale, had neither beene libelles (as you tearme them) neither yet vnduelye printed. Why should they not informe his Holynes, and giue notice to all all the vvorld hovv vniustlye and vnchristianlye they vvere dealt vvith all before the coming of the breue, to be called, counted, and by vvriten bookes prooued Schismaticks, for not admitting an exorbitant dignitie vpon a Card. bare letters. And againe after the comminge of the bull. and their acceptatiō of that dignitie, the same cryme to be renevved, and so horrible a cryme to be imputed to them againe. If you iustlye accuse them for imputing far lister faults to Fa. Pars. and others, and take them vp egerlye for the same? hovv can you finde fault

with them for defending and clearing them ſelues from ſo horrible a ſinne, next colyn to Hereſie? and worſe then ſoothſaying and Idolatrie it ſelfe they wrote then both for the defence of their good name and fame, which is iuſt and naturall, and to aduertyſe his Holynes of their vſage, requeſting him either to quit, or condemne them by his ſentence. To this end they published their booke, as they affirme, and you ſelues cannot well denie. the which ſentẽce of his Hol. which (you ſaie) you expect, is come out alreadie (as I haue heard) and if I be not deceaued I haue read it alſo. In the which he condemneth expreſſely fat. Liſters booke of ſchiſme, and theirs alſo commanding ſilence and forbidding anie more writing. the which yet you (that ſo often obiect contempt of his Holynes and his doings to others) doe neyther obſerue nor obey.

Fol. 162. Of the 6. abuſes you finde in the title of their latyn beoke.

The firſt of the 5. or 6. abuſes which yov finde with the title of the latyn booke is. Becau- they make the ſtrife to be betweene them ād the Ieſuites and the Archp. fauoring them. this to be falſe and that their ſtrife is cheifly e with M. Blackwell, whom they make in their title but an Appendix, you proove, becauſe the Appellation is made againſt M. Blackewell But they ſhew, and your ſelues elswhere con feſſe that their cheifeſt ſtrife is with fat. Parſ. for giuing falſe informatiõs for this ſubordination, and with Fath. Liſter for writing his

The cheiſe ſtrife is vvith the Ieſuits.

booke of ſchiſme, and fa. Garnet for the approuing thereof. Yet was their firſt falling out with fat. Weſton and the others before named, manie a daie, yea ſome yeares before they appealed and therefore it is playne truth and not *falſehod*, that they put the Ieſuits in the firſt place and M. Blackw. in the ſecond. For much ſtrife and contentiō had they with the Ieſuits long before M. Blackw. vvas made Archepriest.

The ſecond fault is faultes.

Your ſecond fault alſo is faultles in them. for had they ſaid: and *all the Seminarie prieſts*, thē had they lyed in deed. but ſaying onely *and the Seminarie prieſts*, they ſaid true, for they are Seminarie prieſts, but you ſaye this vvas but a poore faulte and therefore paſſed it ouer lightlye.

Thirdlye they ſaye *from the death of Card. Allen.* you adde that this ſturre againſt the fathers vvas begonne in England in his dayes. If in his dayes? then might it be continued from his death. you looke verie narrovvlye to finde hoales, vvhere none are, they doe not ſaie the troubles beganne but from his death. but that haue tyſen from his death. that is, haue beene increaſed. And here by your ovvne vvords is prooued that vvhich I ſaid before: that theſe prieſts vvere in trouble and contētion vvith the Ieſuits ſome yeares before the Inſtituting of the Archpr. for your ſaie: *That the contentions againſt the Ieſuites vvere*

your ovvne vvords againſt you.
Fol. 162.

begonne in England euen in Card. Allens daies. by conſequence then, they committed noe abuſe to put the Ieſuits before M. Blackvvell and much leſſe is it then *a playne falshood.*

The fourth is no abuſe.

Fourthly, they ſay: Ad S. D. N. Clementē octauum exhibita ab ipſis ſacerdotibus, that this declaration *vvas exhibited by the Prieſts them ſelues to our moſt holie father Pope Clemēt the* 8. I ſee not to vvhat purpoſe you put this dovvne, you do not acknovvledge it your ſel ues to be an abuſe. What matter is it I praye you (ſo it be exhibited to his Holines) vvhe-ther it be exhibited by them ſelues or ſomme other therir frend or foe? as it vvas exhibited by the Archp. as you ſaie before. For the ap-peale and the booke being printed and boūd together, I cannot ſee hovv the one could be preſented vvithout the other. except the Ar-ch. did cut of the booke, and ſend the appea-le onely. What matter (I ſaie) maketh it, ſo it come at lēgh to the Popes knowledge (which is the ſcope of their vvriting) as it did come indeed, the vvhich maie appeare by the bre-ue he ſent dovvne, to condemne both theirs, and Fa. Liſters booke alſo.

Neither is this vvord *exhibit*, to be taken ſo ſtrittly, as you ſeeme to take it, that is: to deliuer vp into the Popes hands, but in his vſ-uall and common ſignification: vvhich is to ſet abroad for euerie man to behold, or to offer and shevve a thing to another. But why

did you not put dovvne all their vvords at lenght vvithout nipping of the latter vvords vvere you afraid of ſomme buggs? or did your conſciences accuſe you for the former iniurie of ſchiſme laid againſt them? of the vvhich you talke not vvillingly: and are ſorie to heare of it. Why did you not ſpeake out ād ſaie as they doe: ab ipſis ſacerdotibus qui ſchiſmatis aliorumque criminum ſunt inſimulati. *exhibited by thoſe prieſts that vvere vnduely accuſed and appeached of ſchiſme and others crimes.* I cannot blame you if you abhorre the vvorde *ſchiſme.* becauſe the vniuſt, vncharitable, and vnlearned accuſation of your brethrē of this ſchiſme vvas the ſpringe and fountaine of this trouble, your conſciences doe teſtifie as much, and therefore you nipped of theſe vvords vvhich declare the cauſe of their vvriting ād exhibiting their latin booke to his Holynes. And beſides in this vvhole booke you neuer enter into ſpeech of this matter, albeit the ſame be the ground of all this contention but vvith other toyes and flymflamms, you turne your readers eyes and intention from marking this point.

Nippers.

The vnited doe inſtlye abhorre the vvord ſchiſme.

As for the 5. abuſe vvhich you gather by the application of the verſe of the Pſalme to their booke: I paſſe ouer being no diuyne ād therefore cannot iudge vvhether they or you explicate it moſt aptlye.

Fol. 162. b

You 6. reprehenſion is verie foolish: the vvhich

which as for saying: their booke *vvas printed at Roan in the hovvse of Iames Molens*, and you confesse *you knovve not vvhether there be aine such signe or man dvvelling in Roan or no.* If you cannot precisely saie their is no such mā, why doe you finde fault with thē for saying there is such a man. You should haue doō well if you had followed the same counsell which you gaue them a litle before, to send a letter to Rome to his Hol. his nephewe or some other frend to know whether the Car. instituted the Archp. by his Hol. consent or no. So might you with lesse cost and charges, haue sent from Flaundres (where this booke was printed) to Roan, to knowe vvhether their be such a printer so named or no, If not? then you might haue precisely said, there is none such, and as precisely taxe them: but if you had found such a printer there. Then might you haue saued this labor. but you are lyke to such as can giue good connsell to others, but will followe, none them selues. *The 6. is a foolysch reprehēsion 163.*

Well then, seeing that all yours. *absurdities, be neither absurdities, shifts, nor falshoods,* but that you haue committed a manifest falshood in nipping of these words. ab ipsis sacerdotibus qui schismatis aliorumque criminum sunt insimulati, to which one shift &c. falshood, all their 6. are not comparable, albeit they vvere shiftes and falshoods novve your readers maye imagine vvhat stuffe the *Fol. 163. and 164*

Their 6. faults if they vvere such not comparable to your ovvne fault.

Remnant will be. And if we maie preſume (as the lawe ſaith a præteritis de futuris) by that which you haue alreadie ſaid, of that which you are like hereafter to ſaie: then ſure I am, that you will not ſaie much to the matter, nor come neere the qneſtion. nor yet anſvveare there reaſons, for as yet you haue done neither of the three.

Pag. 5. To their 2. reaſons that cauſed them to print their bookes. The firſt: *They could not haue copies inough in vvritten hand:* You anſvvere is: *That manie copies vvas not needfull, if they vvere onelye for his Holines information as they pretend.* Indeed if they were onelye for his Holynes information ſo manie copies needed not: but where doe they pretēd that they wrote for his Holynes onelye information? their intention was not onelye to informe his Holynes, but alſo to defend their innocēcie, fame, and good name, that was blotted & blemished, both at home, and in forraine cōtreyes by Fa. Liſters booke, the copies vvhereof flewe ouer into ſtrange countreyes, ſent and diſperſed euerie where by the Fathers. And this is the third reaſon, wich they giue in that place in the margent, which you willinglye omit.

Fol. 164. *The firſt reaſon for printing their booke is good.*

Pog. 5. *The ſecād reaſō.* Fol. 164. The ſeconde reaſon. *To get their good names againe in forraine nations taken avvaye by the Ieſuits* wherto you anſwere, *that in your opinion it vvill fall out quite contrarye:* to witte

vvhere before they vvere not infamous nor yet knovvne: novv they shalbe both by their infamatorie vvritinge. This is perchaunce but your owne opinion. Howsoeuer it will fall out vvith them, my opinion is, yea I am full sure of it, that somme others that haue beene medlers herein, especiallye the writer and the confirmer of the booke of schisme against them, haue lost much of their credit alreadie by the devulgating of these bookes, and that their best frends hould downe their heads for shame when it cometh in talke. And as litle credite I beleeue, you will get (by these your Apologies) both at home and abroade, as you deeme maye happe to them for theire bookes.

Take heed this prophecie fall not vpon your selues.

From the 164. leafe of your booke to the 168. you rune ouer their latin booke and doe duly reprehend them for their writting against certaine reuerēd and vertuous parsōs. But yet I marke, you willingly omitt and neglecte their quarrel against some Iesuits and specially Father Lister, for writting against them and Father Garnet for approuinge the same. This is, as I haue often repeted the grownde of theis troubles and contentions. Hinc fundi nostri calamitas. Here you should either haue defended Father Lister or haue condemned him (as in your conscience you doe) but you are of that veine, that if you should condemne or dislike of any thinge in

you repreiend them iustly.

VVilling omission.

one Ieſuit, you thinke it would denigrat the praiſes you attribute to thothers. But for all this, you being prieſtes and confeſſors should ſpeake the truth and shame the deuil and lay the fault, vvhere it is. You knovv vvho ſaid: *Amicus Plato, Amicus Socrates, ſed magis amica veritas.* But vvith you, the Fathers and their praiſe are more reſpected, then the truth it ſelf.

Speak truth.

Vneuẽ dealing.

They goe about (ſay you) to shevve that the Archprieſt hard proceeding with them, vvas cauſe of their nevve contentions and ſturres. This you prooue by 2. Marginall notes of theirs. But vvhy did you not put downe the text alſo? Why did you not ſett downe the Arcprieſt his epiſtle renevving the wounde of ſchiſme and coũting them ſchiſmaticks? Why? bicauſe you loue not to talk of the matter. albeit the ſame be the chiefiſt pointe in the controuerſie. That is: Whither they be Schiſmatickes for vviſtanding the Card. letter? But bicauſe you will not talk of it, and that you are loath to heare of it, and eſpecially for that I would inculcate into the memory of the reader the true cauſe of theis contentions, and call to his mynde, What you should haue handled, I doe ſo much the oftener and vvillinger repete it. But is not this a prettie trik? You alleage the page vvhere the epiſt. is, you knovv that the Arch. ouer shott him ſelf in it, and yet you come in with, *But*

Mark ſtill the queſtion in controuerſie.

ſuppoſe he ouershott himſelf, and then, *vvas this a ſufficient cauſe for prieſts, &c.* Yea forſooth, and for monkes toe, to defend their good name and fame, and eſpecially to acquitt them ſelues of ſo hainous a crime as ſchiſme is in that contrey, in time of perſecution for the ſatisfaction of their ſpirituall childrē, and contentment of all that knevve them. for had they held their peace, they should haue beene iudged and holden for ſuch in deed, and that worthily our Sauiour him ſelfs gaue them example to defend their fame. For whē the Ievves had ſaid to him. *Samaritanus es tu & Dæmonium habes.* He anſvvered: *ego Demonium non habeo.* And ſo defended his good name. What man of reaſon or religion vvill not allowe of this? Who will ſay (With you) that theſe mē are out of the right or true path of prieſtly proceeding, vvho doe but that vvhich god ād nature permitt thē to doe: that is to defend their good name againſt ſlaunderous and exorbitant calumnies. Lett euery indifferent reader conſider well vvhat you do in this place, and they shall find, that you make your ſelues a man of clovvtes to fight againſt, and then you rune furiouſly at him vvith hedd hand and feet, but for all that, you hurt him not. No more doe you any thing at all heere touching the matter your take in hand, vvhich is to confute your aduerſaries

Foolish ſuppoſalls.

The peſtes vvere bound to defend their good name.

By the example of our Sauiour.

Fol. 167. b

a mā of clovvtes

VVhat the vnited people sholde haue doone.

booke. For if you vvould haue confuted it, you should haue shevved and proued that, that the epistle of the Archp. vvas not his, or that that epistle did not giue the first cause of this breach, after the comming of the Popes breue. But vvhat (I pray you) doe you herein? Nothinge, but *Suppose it vvas his Epistle*, and then you rage at their tvvo notes in the margent. They say: the begynning of nevve contentions vvas a violent Epistle of the Archpristes and that the Archpriest renevved the vvarres. And this they proued by producing of this Epistle. But you What? Mary *But suppose he ouershott himself.* Well, Suppose he fovvly ouershott him self in calling them Schismaticks, yet say you Prieſtes that profesſe modestie, obedience, and mortificacion &c. should suffre it. Are they more modest obedient and mortified then Saint Augustine? Saying: *Proinde quisquis à criminibus flagitiorum atque facinorum vitam suam custodit, sibi bene facit: quisquis autem famam: & in alios misericors est. Nobis enim necessaria est vita nostra, aliis fama nostra.* Therfore vvho soeuer keapeth him self from synning and offending greuously, he doth good to him self, but vvho soeuer doth keap his good name is mercifull to others. For our life is necessarie to vs, our fame to others. And the same Doctour againe, *Conscientia ne-*

Can. Non sunt. 11. q. 3.

S. August. biddeth them to defend their fame.

Can. Nolo 12. q. 1.

ceſſaria eſt tibi, fama proximo tuo. Qui fidens conſcientiæ ſuæ negligit famam, crudelis eſt, Thy conſcience (that thov liueſt well) is neceſſary to thee thy ſelf: but they fame (that thovv liueſt vvell) is neceſſary in reſpect of thy neighbour. He therfore that truſteth to his conſcience and neglecteth his fame, is cruell. Are they more modeſt and mortified then our Sauiour? Who (as I haue ſaid) anſvvered his calumniators, that he had not the deuill? And Salomon commandeth vs, *Curam habere de bono nomine.* To haue care of our good name. And S. Paule defendeth his good name. Good and iuſt cauſe then had theſe Prieſtes by reaſons and examples alledged, to defend them ſelues, from ſo haynous a crime, put vpon them by the Arehprieſt in his letter or Epiſtle. Which you vvill not ſee, but only ſuppoſe at it. To conclud this pointe notvvithſtanding your bigg and loftie vvords of *Scandalous tumults, exorbitant paſſions, and furious rages* (very vnfitt termes for ſuch Prieſts, as you are that profeſſe modeſtie and mortification, and that are in Ingland, not only to ſuffre, but alſo to dye for Chriſtian Religion) with which you vvould make babies afraide. They had very iuſt cauſe to appeale from ſo vniuſt a iudg charging them both falſlye

Salomon vvilleth them to doe the ſame. Eccl. 41.

S. Paule defended his fame. 2. Cor. 12.

Fol. 168.

The Prieſts had iuſt cauſe to appeale.

and vncharitably, with ſo hainous a crime as ſchiſme is. And that men iuſtlye defending their honor and fame, do nothing at all dyminiſhe, either of their modeſtie, mortificatiō or obedience, neither haue they ſtepped for that, out of the path of Chriſtian Religion, or prieſtly proceading, as you would make not your wiſe but paſſionate and affected reader here beleeue. *And thus much you haue ſaid of the Latine booke.* A short horſe is ſoone curried. If you can anſwere whole bookes ſo briefly, you nead no more large Apol. you are men of diſpatch, I ſee wel, but no marwell: many hands make light work. you are many vnited prieſtes together, and therfore you haue the ſoener done. And yet as brief as you are, *you haue ſpoken more then, at the beginning you thougt to ſay in this place,* Truly if at the beginning you thought not to ſay ſo much, you thought to ſay very litle or nothing. For touching the principall pointes of the booke, ād the matters therof in controuerſie, you haue yet ſaid nothing at all in this chapt. I know not what you will doe hereafter. Now to the English booke for as for the third booke vvritten to the Inquiſition, you touch it not, bicauſe they keapt cloſe to the matter, and did not fling out at the Ieſuits and ſpecially at Fa. Perſons, as in th'other they doe, ād ſo doing gaue you

Fol. 169.

A vvhole booke briefely anſvvered

Thouchinge the pridcipall you haue as yet ſaid nothinge.

You touch not nor mention their booke to the Inquiſitors.

no occation of vvritting. If the thad bene as modeſt in their book to his Holl. vve had loſt the notable peece of vvork of this Apologie. *Dixit Piger, leo eſt in via.* The ſlouth full excuſe them ſelues ſayinge, there is a lion in thewaie. What ſoeuer they meane by it, or hovv ſoeuer you interpret it of ouer throvving all that ſtand in their way, Superioritie, Reaſon, Religion, and S. Peters koies, &c. I may vvell applie it to this Apologie of yours. For you are ſo ſlouthfull or ſo fearefull of the lion that lieth in the vvay, that is, to come neare the points in queſtion or to handle any one of them, as you ought to haue done, that for feare of that lion or of the iuſtice of their cauſe you dare not put out your head ſo much as once to looke them in the face. You vvent very neare in deed, yea ſo neare as the margent, but you durſt not looke ouer into the text, for there lay the lion. that is, the Archprieſts epiſtle, vvhich was the originall and foundamentall cauſe of theſe laſt controuerſies, and writting of theſe bookes. If you had not bene ſlouth full covvards you ſhould haue caught that lion by the eares, and plucked him out of his denme. and if you had foūd him to haue had venyme ād no hony in his mouth, you ſhould haue torne him in ſonder as Sampſon did: that is, haue freely confeſſed the truth, and blamed your Archp. for ſuch an vncharitable act. other-

Fol. 172.

Proverb. 26.

This peec of ſcripture interpreted againſt the vnited.

Fol. 167. b.

Such as vvrit vvith conſcience ſhould haue done this.

wiſe if you had found him a vvolfe in a lions skine, you should haue pluckt the skin ouer his eares: that is if you had found that it vvas not M Blackvvels letter, then you should haue diſcovered their falſehood and impoſture by fathering that vpon him that vvas none of his. But it was in deed a lion and neither wolf, fox or beare, and therfore you lett him alone, and durſt not come neare him. So that this ſentence man vvell be applied to the fashion of your writting. hovv you dare not come neare the lion, that is, examine the true queſtion of this controuerſie.

Fol. 172. An vncharitable vvronge.

Why do you vvrong your bretherne by ſaying, That they taking vpon them in the place (of their English booke) to the Reader to ſett dovvne the true ſtate of the queſtion, putt it dovvne vvholly to the contrarye. Lett vs ſee, if you be true men of your vvorde, There are handled in their bookes 2. controuerſies (the vvhich being lions, you shonne and feare ſo much that you dare not come neare vnto them) The firſt is: that the Archprieſt was not orderly inſtituted, by the Card. letters and them ſelues vniuſtly called ſchiſmaticks for not receauing him vpon thoſe letters. The ſecond. That after the Bull came and all had ſubmitted them ſelues thereto, the Archprieſt ſett abroch the old matter of ſchiſme, and as ſchiſmaticks forbad (by his letters) them to be abſolued of any Prieſt ex-

The firſt controuerſie.

The ſecond controuerſie.

'cept they acknowleged their Schisme and disobedience. The first they sett downe in the said preface thus. The striefe and dissen- « tion at this day too great and scandalous in « Ingland is maynteined by the Archpriest the « Iesuits ād their adherents against those Pric- « stes vvho did forbeare to subiect them selues « vnto the Archpriest constituted in authori- « tie ouer all the Seminarie Priestes in Inglād « and Scotland by a Cardinall who was Prote- « ctor of the English colleag at Rome and af- « terwards honored vvith the title of Prote- « ctor of Ingland, for the which forbearing to « subiect thē selues at the first making know- « ne of this auctoritye, the Priests were accu- « sed of schisme, sedition, faction, rebellion, « &c. Doe you putt downe the question in cō- « trouersie so simplie and plainly in your first « chapt. as you make your Readers beleeue by your title you would doe? Nothing lesse. Let any man reade ouer that chapt. and he shall find no case or state of the questiō proposed. You fly it, as it were from a lion. There you shall find a ragmans roole of all the contentions and factions that hath bene in Fraunce, Italy and Flanders for many yeres. Fa. Parsons retorne from Spaigne to Rome, mention of a nevv association, of Fishers confession, of Fa. Parsons information, and of the conclusion taken to make an Archpriest rather thē a Bishopp, and that he should rather be in-

From fol. 2. to b.

Fol. 6. b. and 7.

Fol. 7. b.

ſtituted by the Card. letters then by the Popes bulls: of a great nombre of letters, of D. Bishopp, and M. Charnoks examination, of the new Breue, of Fa. Parſons letters to M. Collington ād to M. Mushe, of appeales without proſecution, of M. Charn. letter to Card. Burgheſius, of the Archprieſt being made Prothonotarius Apoſtolicus, and ſo the ende.

Fol 8.b. *Fol.9.* *Fol.10.*

You promiſe much, but parforme nothing.

Wheare is *the ſtate of the preſent controuerſie in queſtion*, that you theare promiſed. Lett the vvorld iudge, who are rather to be beleaved, they that goe plainly and ſimply to work, and that ſett downe the queſtiō truly ād nakedly without pompe or florish of words? or you that promiſe mountaines, and do not giue vs ſo much as mowlehills? that make men beleue by the title of your chapter, you will goe plainly to vvorke, but in the end ſerue them vvith title tatle and nothing els. What appertaine all theis things recovvnted vpp before, to the controuerſie in queſtion? and yet you ſay nothinge els. If I haue leaft out any ſubſtantiall point of your firſt chapter chardg me hardly in your next, if it be rightfully, I will ask forgiuennes, if vniuſtly, I will haue my right. The firſt cauſe thē of all theis troubles, is, for that the Ieſuits wrott, taught and auovved that the Prieſts that refuſed to obay the Archp. and to take him for their Superior, being only inſtituted by a Card.

letters vvithout the Popes Bulles, vveare Schiſmaticks ſeditious, factious and rebellious,&c.but of this you will not heare. *Leo eſt in via.* You dare not come neare it.

This you confeſſe alſo your ſelues in ſaying. *you vvill not talk of it*: that is as much to ſay,you vvill not meadle vvith the pointe in controuerſie, but vvil rune at Random,and diſcourſe and talk of vvhat matter you liſt, thoughe it come not noe nearer the queſtiō then Barwick comes to London. *You vvill not meadle vvith the point in controuerſie.*

The ſecond controuerſie they put downe in the ſame preface in theiſe vvords: A peace was made to the great confort of all Catholicks,vvhen his Holl. breue vvas preſented to them. But this peace vvas ſoone after broken by the meanes of the Ieſuits, who revived the ſame calumniation againſt the Prieſts and by the Archprieſt vvho did not only averre the aſſertions of the Ieſuits,but publiſhed alſo that he had receved a reſollution frō the mother Cittie (to vſe his termes) which avowed that the refuſers of the auctoritye vvere ſchiſmaticks. *Pag.* 3.

The cauſe then of this deuiſion is not for any reſiſtaunce of the Prieſtes againſt the Archprieſt but for that the Prieſtes vvill not acknowledg that in the time of their forbearance to ſubſcribe to the auctoritye they vvere factious, ſeditious rebellious ſchiſmaticks,enormouſly diſobedient, in continuall

mortall ſinne, practiſing their functions in irrigularitye,&c. Loe hovv plainly ſimply andtruly (for any thing you ſay to the contrary) they putt downe the caſe. You ſay it is ſett dovvne vvholly to the contrarye, you proue it not. We muſt beleaue you, bicauſe you are vnited ſtedfaſtly in this, neuer to touch the queſtion, but to evacuate the ſaying and diſgrace the perſones of your bretherne all you may. You ſay in putting theis caſes, *they debaſe the Archprieſt and the Protector*: but you tell vs not vvherein. You are men of vvonder full auctoritie that you muſt be beleaved vpon your word. I haue proued to you before, that a Card. is not to be beleaued vpon his bare word in an other mans prejudice: ād why ſhall we beleaue you in ſclaunderīg your bretherne vvithout cauſe? Sheve me in your next by vvh'atwords in theis 2. caſes by thē propoſed, they haue debazed the perſones by you named. for vntill then, you haue loſt your credit with me. They haue ſett it downe (you ſay) wholy to the cōtrary. Why are you in ſuch haſt, that you cannot ſtay to tell vs wherein? What Aſſe vvill geve credit to your bookes, vvritting ſo negligently and ſo fondly, that you are not able to shevve one reaſon of your negatiue doctrine. You add *that in the end they lay a foundation to all diſobedēce*. But you tell vs not in which end, either of the preface or of the book: for in the 2. caſes

Vnited you are neuer to touch the queſtion.

Marke.

propoſed, there is not the leaſt ſurmiſe therof. But peraduenture you meane theis ends you lay dovvne, in the vvhich, th'one *Thirſteth the good of his Reader* and th'other biddeth you *Fare vvell.* In deed theiſe be your impertinent diſcourſes, as you note vvell in the margent, and I add to the text foolish alſo. *No no*, S. (ſay you) *you may ſee more noted before in the ſecond chapter.* Well in Gods name. Let vs goe backagaince thither. What ſhall I ſee theare? That they haue put downe the ſtate of the queſtion vvholy to the cõtrary. Is it true? that vvould I faine ſee. *Fiat voluntas tua.* for ſo you begine, and the Sermon contineweth vntill Card. Allens letters ſent to M. Mushe interrupted the prechear and Card. Sega his viſitation. You thirſt (by all liklihood) the good of your Readers that begine ſo devoutly, ãd goe on ſo honorably vvith 2. Cardinalls in the fore frõt. But bevvaire (Maiſters) of your geeſe when the tox precheth. Then after the Cardinals march the Popes ſpeeches ſent into Ingland Exhorting and chardging men to liue in vnitie. Next to his Hol. marcheth Fishers memoriall againſt the Ieſuits, being one of the moſt exorbitant diſorderly fellowes in the Romaine ſturrs, and yet thought a fitt man by you to be put in your booke. Next to his Hol. after Fisher in ſtead of a Trumpettor marcheeh. *No alas, is this the vertue of obedience? is this humilitie? is this, &c.*

Fol. 172. b. *A foolish toye.*

You ſend vs to a chapt. that hath no ſuch thing in it.

Fol. 10. b.

Fol. 11.

Fol. 12.

Fol. 13.

Next followeth that which I haue before confuted, so that I cann see nothing in that chapter, that proveth They haue putt the state of the question wholly to the contrary, and yet I promise you I did read it ouer with my Spectacles wherfore I beseech some of you, that haue a cleerer sight then I haue, and that can see more with twoe eies them I can do with foure, to note me the leafe where I may see more noted in that chapter. You did well to send your Readers from the 11. chapt. to the second, to seek for that, which they shall neuer find there, and that which you should haue shewne them in this place, if you could. But *Leo est in via.* Truth lay in your waye, which is more impregnable thē a lion, and more immovable then a Rock. If you had had a desire to instruct your Reader in good sooth, ād not to haue him deceaued: you would not, or at least should not, haue sent him to rune ouer a longe chapter to search that which was not to be found, but for his more ease to haue quoted the leafe of your booke wherin he might haue found it. But your intention was if not to deceiue him, yet to deliurer your self by that shifte from shewing and prouing that they *put the question wholly to the contrary.* Theis fowle shiefts may for a time hold some fooles in suspence, but in the end it will turne to the shame of the Authors.

A suttle sending.

The force of truth.

And vndecent shiefte for vnited people.

Fol. 168.
Fol. 172.

You

You anſwered the Latine book briefly, as before, but here you anſvvere *tvvo vvhole diſcourſes* Maruaillous Lacoanically ād very merrely. The one, with, he thirſteth the good of the Readers, th'other with Fare yov vvell. This in ſooth is to play vvith your Readers noſe ād shew your ſelues to be more like Scorners then graue Prieſtes. *Fare you vvell*, and vvhy did you not add, ād Iack shall haue Gill. You are counning men that can anſwere twoe treatiſſes vvith tvvoe vvords. You should haue much a doe to anſvvere M. Watſons common vvealth, (vvhich yet is not ſo long as theiſe 2. treatiſſes) vvith ſuch Scholaſticall or rather ſophiſticall brevitie. It should ſeame, that either you haue great cōfidence in your cauſe, vvhen you may be admitted to anſvvere your aduerſaries reaſons vvith a fare vvell, or els that you do not greatly thirſt the good of your Readers ād much leſſe care for their ſatisfaction, that expected from graue vnited Prieſtes the confutatiō of Reaſons laid dovvne in thoſe diſcourſes, and not a Ieſt of vvil Sommars budgett. Who is ſo blinded, that doth not ſee their Reaſons to ſtand firme and ſolide, vvhich are ſett dovvne both in the letter, that thirſteth the good of the Reader, as alſo in th'other that biddeth you Fare vvell: for all that you haue ſaid either here, or in the ſecond chapter noted in your margent. For of 5. conſiderations putt

Tvvoe diſcourſes anſvvered vvith tvvoe vvords.

You should haue confuted the Reaſons that be in thoſe diſcourſes.

dovvne in the letter that thirſteth the good of the Reader, you ſeeme in your 2. chapt. to
Fol.15. anſwere one vvhich is of the *Premunire* as for th'other 4. your bidd them fare vvell. And ſo
A notable cuſtome. great is the thirſt you haue of the Readers good, that it is your cuſtome through out your Apologie, to anſvvere ſome one argument or reaſon, and then make him beleue you haue anſvvered them all, and ſo he muſt content him ſelf vvith a peece, either that, or none at all.

And albeit you anſvvere nothing here to the Reaſons of your nameleſſe frende Fare you vvell, yet afterwards leaping (according to your cuſtome) diſorderly from one thing to another: and after a flinge at M. Chápeneis letter, you leape back to Fare you
Fol. 174. vvell againe to anſvvere to the oſtentation
Diſt 63. can. 12. of their Canon ſo often cited. I know not
Diſt. 61. can. 13. hovv often they cited it, but ſuer I am, you cited it once before, and their vvordes falſely, as I haue there noated. You anſvvere not
Fol. 18 b. the Canon there. But now after you haue taken your breath ād bethought your ſelf better, you vvill anſwere it (I trovve) very ſufficiently: *bicauſe any man of meane learning may diſcouer hovv litle this maketh for them.* If this be true then no doubt but mē of your learning vvill diſcouer to vs, hovv litle this maketh for their purpoſe. vvhich if you performe, then will I bidd them and you both Fare well

and meadle no further in this matter, but thirst my ovvne rest and quietnes. Well on then Maisters myne.

After you haue shevved your skill in antiquitie and of diuers meanes of constituting and appointing Bishopps, at last. *You thinck your bretherne vvill not denie the preeminent auctoritye of the Sea Apostolicke in all theis elections, and aboue all that he might, and hath lawfully changed the same.* Fol. 174. I answvere for them, they vvill not denie this. But vvhat then? Mary *If his Holl. can alter election in ordinary Bishopps, much more he may appoint an extraordinary Prelat as the Archprieſt is, with vvhat Iurisdiction he thimketh expedient.* Transeat, *and therfore so much to vrge this, is great presumption to call it no vvorse.* haue you said? Then say I, your answvere is but a meere folly to call it no vvorse. for they talk of cheese ād you giue them chalke. They talke, speake and meane of the ordinary and accustomable meanes of election, constituted and appointed by the Canons and decrees of the Sea Apostolick, and you talk of the supereminent povver or plenitudine potestatis that his Holl. hath ouer all benefices and Iurisdictions to giue them to vvhom he will ād by vvhat meanes and order it pleaseth him. If you thinck your brethern are not ignorant of this, you might haue leaft it out, for it answvereth not their Canon that talketh of the ordinarie meanes by election. And so their

A foolish answveare.

Distingo.

C. 2. de prebend. in 6. & Clem. 1. vt lite pendens, &c.

The Canon is not answvered.

Canon ſtandeth ſtill for them. Note heare that you your ſelues call this auctoritye of the Archprieſt extraordinarie and that he is an extraordinary Prelate. Why then are you ſo rash I vvill not ſay impudēt to make your reader beleaue, *your bretherne ſpeak very contemptuously of the dignitie, and Archprieſt, bicauſe they call it a nevv and extraordinary auctoritye* well either you ſpeake contemptuouſly here in calling his dignitie extraordinary, and ſo fall into the ſame fault your bretherne did, or els if you do not, you muſt ask them forgiuenes for ſlaundering them vniuſtlye vvith contempt for ſaying that the Archprieſt dignitie and Iuriſdiction is extraordinary. This is a rule of nature *quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.* You vvould be loath to be counted to ſpeake this in contempt, ſo then muſt you iudg of them, that they did not ſpeake it in contempt, as in deed they did not, and therfore be vniuſtly taunted ād noted of contēpt by you for it. The gloſſe you alleadg theare is againſt you. for it vndreſtandeth of ordinary election vvherein the nomber of voices carrieth it avvay, and ſo if the greater parte chooſe one to be a Bishoppe and the leſſer part or fevver in nomber chooſe him not, he shalbe their Bishopp againſt their vvills, bicauſe he vvas canonically elected viz by the greter nomber of thoſe that had right to chooſe him. So that your contradicting

Fol. 14. Rash reprehenſion.

The vnited are bound to ask their brethern forgivennes.

Gloſſ. 1. ad can. 13. diſt. 61. The gloſſe is againſt you alſo.

brethern nor none els comming to the election are not condempned, neither are they the lesser parte, vvhere vvas no part at all. Mary, if it had come to the election and 200. Priestes had chooſen M. Blackvvell, and your contradicting bretherne vvith an hundred moe on their ſide had choſen an other: M. Blackwell had bine their ſuperior againſt their vvills, as choſen by the greater nomber. And yet this leſſer nombre had not bene cõ- *Your error.*
dempned by the Canon as you ſay, but by the gloſſe, neither yet abſolutlie by the gloſſe. For if the leſſer part (ſaith he) hath iuſtam cauſam contradicendi. iuſt cauſe to vvithſtãd the election. A Bishopp cannot beginen to them againſt their vvills. Your gloſſe then talketh of the ordinary way of election, and you of the extraordinary povver, and Iuriſdiction of his Holl. you haue allvvaies good luck to alleadge lawe againſt your ſelues, as thoſe accuſtomedly doe, that impugne a truth as you doe. But here by the waye I muſt *Ignorance.* *Fol. 174. b.*
a little note yonr ignorance in that you ſay that his Holl. Legates and Nuncios often be neither Bishopps nor Archbishopps: I am ſuer the eldeſt of you all neuer ſavve or hard of any of the Popes Nuncios, but they vvere Bishoppes. Neither doth his Hol. make any, at leaſt Nuncios, but ſuch as are Bishopps. And as for Legates, for ſome hundreth yeres, theare hath bene neither Bishopp nor Arch-

bishopp but alwaies Cardinalls vvhich are called Legati a Latere, *per excellentiam quia semper mittuntur a latere Pontificis*. The siege Apostolicke sendeth no other Legates but Cardinalls, nor none other there is, but such as vve call Legati nati, such as is the Archbishopp of Canturbury in Ingland, And as his Holl. giueth more ample or more strickt authoritie and Iurisdiction to his Nuncios, so doth he allvvaies restraine the Iurisdiction of his Legats: for if he did not, they had de iure almost as great as he him selfhath. I once saw an indult giuen to a Legat a latere vvherin vvere but 4. things reserued from his povver and Iurisdiction. The first that he had no auctoritye to alienat the patrimonie of S. Peter. The second he had no povver to alienat the goods of the churches vnder his Legation. The 3. he had no Iurisdiction to conferre Bishopprickes. The 4. I do not remenbre. You may then see by this that so lardg is the Iurisdiction of a Legat a Latere, that the Pope doth dyminish his Iurisdictiō, rather then amplyfie or extend it. And so good reader fare well for we must backagaine to M. Champ. letter, to see vvhat he can say for him self.

C. 1. de offi. Legati in 6. C. pen. ext. de offic. Legati.

Fol. 172. b. 173. *If he be as fond and childish, as the former discourses*, the vvhich you neither haue nor can answere, but by a farewell. thé were you childish to putt them dovvne, and by your not

answering him, vtter your childishnes to the vvorld.

First and formost you exagirat his example of a noble man, vvhich you say is no more like the case in controuersie then London is to Lincolne. And vvhy so? bicause the Protector vvrott by the expresse commandement of his Holl. Hovv shall vve knovv, that? Mary he saith so in his letters. But I haue proved to you before that a Cardinall be he a hūdred times Protector, is not to be beleaued absolutly vpon his vvorde, and letters: the dissimilitude (you say) consisteth in this that the Cardinall is of the Popes Counsell, ād to him is committed all the affaires of Ingland, and so vvas not the Gentleman M. Champeney talketh of. Be it so, yet M. Champeney preuented this your answere, the which you will not see, you are so vvillfully blinde. For theise be his vvords: Tvvo disparites paraduenture they vvill alleage in the case. First, that I putt the case in ciuill gouermēt vvhereas it ought to be in Ecclesiasticall. The secōd, that I putt the case in one that is not knovvne to haue any ordinary authoritye in theise affaires, vvheras it is contrary in our affaires, the Cardinall being Protector of our Nation. Loe here your answere sett dovvne for you in this chisdish lettere the vvhich he āsvvereth thus. I omitt the answere to the first (as impertinent to this place) the second is as frivolous. For albeit Card. Caietane vvas our Protector

Fol. 173.

A false dissimilitud.

You answere vvas prevented Pag. 24.

and alſo Chamberlaine of the church of Rome: yet it is euident that by neither of theis offices had he any ordinary Eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction (he might alſo very vvell haue added nor extraordinarye Iutiſdiction) by theiſe offices) ouer our clergie eſpecially to erect any nevv gouernement. And therfore if he had any auctoritye in this matter it muſt needs be delegat and extraordinary and conſequently, vvas as vvell to notifie to vs the ſame (his extraordinary auctoritye) as the Chaunceler of Ingland is to shevve his vvarrant, if he intend to take vpon him an other office, not appertayning to the Chauncellorſhipp. Thus farre this younge man come latly from ſchole vvho by that he hath here ſaid, putteth you all in ſooth, ſo to ſchoole, that he maketh you all as dõbe as Fishes, not ſaying hetevnto ſo much as Baff: and vvhy? bicauſe Leo eſt in via. The truth vvhich he alleageth is ſo ſtronge, that it ſtoppeth your mouthes, ſo that you cannot open your lipps againſt it. If he *not the beſt learned amongſt his fellovves* be able to ſtopp your mowthes, ſo that you cannot anſvvere him, and to make you ſo blinde, that you will not ſee this reaſõ. What vvould his learneder fellovves doe, eſpecially if they were vnited to writ, as you are. How ſay you? Hath he not cleerly shevved, that there is no diſparitye betvveene the caſe putt in the Cardinall, and the caſe he putt, &c. in the Gentleman. All thoſe that are cleare of ſight can ſee

The younge ſcholler putteth you all to ſchole.

Fol.173.

ād vvill cōfeſſe it. And here by the vvay (you my brethetne) hauing read this, ād ſeeing he flattly and truly denieth the Protector to haue any ordinarie iuriſdiction ouer the English clergie, why are you ſo impudent in all this your booke, yea in euerv leafe almoſt, to obiect to them diſobediēce to the Protector as their ſuperior? how are you ſo impudent as to tearme the Protector their and your ſuperior? yea your higheſt ſuperior nexr his Holl. I ſay impudent, for if he were, and they denie it ſo flattly and apparently, it vvas yout parte to controle them for it, and to proue the contrarie, that he was both theirs and your ordinary ſuperior, in that he is protector. But the thing being denied by them, and the contrary not proued by you, it is extreme impuden cie ſo often to affirme it, and to put it downe *Note.* in your booke, as a thinge vndoubtable and aknowe truth, when it is kovven to all that haue but a cromme of witt and experience, that it is ſtarke falſe to ſay. *That the Protector of Ingland is Superiar to any Englishmen in the vvorld*, Be he clark or lay, be he in Rome or in Ingland. Note beſide reader, his learned diſtinction of Iudgs. That euery iudg is either an ordinary iudge, or a iudg delegat, that is extraordinary. An ordinary iudg hath iuriſdiction ordinary ouer all ſuch as are ſubiect to him: but a delegat iudge hath no iuriſdiction of his oWne, he hath only the vſe of an other mans iuriſdiction, that is to ſay, the

Tit. ext. de off. Iud. ordinar. & tit. ext de offic, delegat.

iurisdiction of him that doth delegat him, and hath no more thé th' other doth giue him the vse of, neither must he passe the limites of his delegation, but obserue it diligently. But the Protector vvas not our ordinarie iudg. Ergo if he be at all, he must be our delegat iudge. But a iudg delegat (saith M. Champeney) must shevve his warrant, and the letters of his commission. But the Protector shevved no such letters. Ergo they were not bound to beleaue thar he was a iudg delegated to institute a new dignitie. In your larger Apologie, I pray you shevve your learning, and answere to this youngmans argument. *Fol.* 174.

Where you aske *vvith vvhat modestie can he say that this gouerment of the Archp. vvas neuer hard of before.* I aske you with what brasen face you dare reprehend him for it, and with vvhat front you dare say, that this gouerment Was euer hard of before? Nay, where is your modestie and honestie to find fault with him, for saying that vvhich your selues say aftervvards? Where you affirme his Holl. *May appoint an extraordinary Prelate as the Archp. is.* If it be extraordinarie vvhere was it euer *hard of it before?* A desiere you haue of contradiciō hath so blinded you that you vtter infinite absurdities, and seeme to say you care not vvhat. Yes vve say some vvhat, for vve say. *That it is vvel knovvne to be an auncient dignitie in gods churche.* In deed the office of an Archp. is an auncient (albeit a very

Impudency.

Fol. 174. *b*

Desire of contradiction blindeth men.

lovve) office in Christes church. But o blindnes. *Is this gouerment*, I say. this, an auncient gouerment in gods church? Was this, I say this, (I must often repeate it, bicause you are become deafe, dombe, and blinde, this *Leo in via*, hath put you in such a fright) gouerment vvhich the Archpriſt hath novv in Ingland, an auncient dignitie in Gods church? I knovv the name is auncient, but this *gouerment* he hath is nevv, and therfore in your next, recant theis vvords or giue your selues the lye, for saying it is an extraordinary Prelacy in the place noted in the margent. And here also you confesse as much. *That his ordinary iurisdiction did not commounly extend so farre and ouer so many as this doth.*

Answere categoricè.

you must recant or be counted liars.

Fol. 174. b

An Archpriest ordinary iurisdiction goeth not ont of the church dores.

Commonly (quoth you) no neuer since Christes Ascension, did it extend out of the churche dores. For sauing of your honesties, and for my learning, in your next promised larger Apologie, bring one example I pray you. you fight still with your owne shadovve, whoI pray you doth not knovv so well as you vvhat the Pope may doe? How great iurisdiction he may giue, and that to vvhom he pleaseth? Theis are fonde and childish matters in deed to treat of, and not novv in question.

We are at last comme againe to M. Champeney *vvho in effect addeth notinge to the 2. former discourses but certaine bold assertiõs.* What need he? when you haue answvered no one of all the assertions conteined in these twoe dis-

courſes, *But the thriſting the readers good and the fare vvell?* Hath he added nothinge? What is that he talketh of ordinarie and extraordinarie iuriſdiction, ſhewing the Protector to haue neither, as you haue ſene before. Sure he addeth enonghe for all you vnited prieſtes and take to helpe you all the Ieſuits in Rome and Ingland, to anſwere to, whiles you liue, except the Pope doe chaunge the canon and Ciuill laWes to helpe you out of the mire.

M. Champeney reaſones vnanſvverable.

His argument is this, all ſuperiors haue either ordinary or extraordinarie iuriſdiction. But protect. of natiõs haue neither ordinary or extraordinary iuriſdiction, as they be Protectors. Ergo Card. Caietane as Protector was not the Superior to the clergie or laytie of Ingland.

His argument.

But lett vs ſee theis *bold aſſertions*, Which are 4. *I ſayes*, and all true for any thinge you bring to the contrarye. For aſweare therevnto, you ſay, *He is a younge man come latly frõ te ſchole, and not the beſt learned amongſt his felovves.* And againe, all this you ſay (not, bicauſe ſuch graue men as you that hath bene ſo long from ſchoole, doe ſay it:) cannot but *import great preſumption of Spirit, and ſo diſcrete men* (vppon your vvordes and credit no doubt) *vvill iudge of him and his, and their cauſe accordingly.* you haue ſo ſufficiently anſvveared his *I ſay* with your *you ſay*, that diſcret mẽ cãnot but wonder at the order ãd ma-

Fovver true I ſayes, anſvvered vvith you ſay.

ner of your vvritting. That is, to put dovvne your aduerſaries vvords, which containe nought but truth it ſelf in them, and then to make ſuch foolish diſcourſes as afterwards you doe, vvithout touchinge or anſwearing them. Surely euery man of any diſcretion in the vvorld muſt needs iudg of you and your cauſe, that loue vvith vvords to mainteine contencion and quitt your cauſe and abandō it vtterlye, as bringing nothing either to vphold it, or to vndermyne and ouerthrovve the cauſe of your aduerſaries. But is not this a bold or rather a falſe aſſertiō of yours to ſay: *VVhich* (I ſay) *ſo often repeted againſt the auctoritie of his Superiors*, When as the Protector (as he told your before) was not his Superior nor the Archp. at that time when he ſpake this, I meane before the bull came for he was no iuſt poſſeſſor of that dignitie, but an intruded parſon, and ſo had no ſuperioritie as I haue alreadie proued. You had nead to goe to ſchoole againe to learne to leaue falſifying, and to forget slandering and vniuſt imputing of vvords and ſences to your aduerſaries, or els to the nouiciat hovvſe to purge you of theyſe foule faults.

you vnited loovve to maintaine contencion.

A falſe aſſertiō.

We haue (ſay you) anſwered *ſuch reaſons as he brought ſufficiently before. and shevved his ignorance in diuinitie and conſidered of the decree of the Doctors of Paris*. Where hare you done this doughtie deed? Mary, in the 10. ch.

you haue not answered his reaſons at all. Ergo not ſufficiently.

of this booke, you would ſay the 8. chaptre. I haue ouer vewed your 10. chapt. Where firſt and foremoſt I find your iumbling at certaine reaſons brought out of the diſcourſe that *Thriſteth the good of the reader*, as you terme it, thē at other words of theirs (as you ſay) for you haue not quoted the place) Iumbling (I ſay) as I haue proued there. Thirdly you heape vp many thīgs out of both bookes but eſpecially the English. You note not the places, bicauſe you ſay they are allmoſt in euery page. Other reaſons you alleage out of the diſcourſe, which you call *fare you vvell*. At laſt in the ſame leafe you come to M. Champeneys epiſtle out of the vvich you alleage but one reaſon, and ſo you Fitton in ſayinge. *Such reaſons as he brought* whē you brought but one of his reaſons to anſvvere. Where I haue ſhewed his reaſon to ſtand firme and his diuinitie not to haue bene ſpilt by ignorance as you ſay here. Where alſo is conſidered, hovv well you conſidered, of the decree of the Doctors of Paris. In the end of the 8. chapt. you ſay: *The reſt vvhich he hath in this epiſtle ſhalbe conſidered of aftervvards againe in a devve and conuenient place.* VVhy? when you vvere in hand vvith him there, vvhy did you not diſpatch him and crush him in the head, and ſo deliuer him at once from the paine and feare he had how you would trovvnce him aftervvards? or vvhy doe you not anſvvere the

Fol. 107. *b*

Fol. 108. *you iumble at theis reaſons only.*

Fol. 110. *A fitton.* *Fol.* 174.

Fol. 118. *b* *VVhy did you differr to anſvvere him theare.*

reſt of his reaſons here, ſeing the young man is vnder your ferule, and ſtandeth quaking at the conſideration he hath of your nōber ād grauitie, and that you are old ſchollers. But be of good cheare M. Champeney pluck vp your hart, they haue no more to ſay to you here, all is remitted to the 8. chap. where they conſidered but one of your reaſons, and that to their ovvne loſſe and diſcredit.

I noted this foule shift of yours before, that when you cannot anſvvere, you ſend your reader to an other place to ſeeke that vvhich he shall neuer finde. So doe you here, you sēd him to ſeeke your anſvvere to M. Champeneis reaſons in the plural, vvhere they shall find but one of his reaſons laid dovvne in the ſinguler nomber. *A fovvle shift.*

Thow muſt knovv reader, that beſide his firſt reaſon laid dovvne by them, there follovveth a ſecond reaſon handled by me before, vvherby he proueth the Card. had no auctoritie to inſtitute the Archpr. becauſe he was neither their ordinarie nor their extraordinary iudge. the force of the vvhich reaſon, I haue laied dovvne before. *Fol. 110.* *Pag. 25.*

Thirdly, *This yong man more reſolute being come latly from the ſchoole*, vrgeth you yet further, and preſuppoſeth the mighteſt obiection you haue againſt your diſcontented bretherne (the vvhich in deed you haue, if not in euery page, yet in euery leafe allmoſt of *you mighteſt obiection is anſvvered fourtſouldly.*

your book, vvhich he alſo anſvvereth foure-foldly) and the vvhich he termeth your *Achilles viz: that to deeme or doubt of that vvhich the Card. affirmeth is to call his credit in queſtiõ vvhoſe authoritie ought to be ſufficient teſtimonie for vvhatſoeuer he ſaieth.* and shevveth that it concludeth not. If theſe vnited people had any deſiere to opẽ the truth to the world and not to deceive their readers, ād ſtill vvallovve in contencion they should in ſteed of this (I ſay) haue taken his anſvveres made to the chiefe piller of their cauſe, and haue confuted them, and ſo by learning and authoritie haue rebarred *this youge ſcholler that gauleth thẽ ſo much, and shevved to the vvorld that he vvas not the beſt learned of his fellovves.* But alas? they durſt not, for *Leo eſt in via.* the roaring lion of truth made them take their heeles and rune avvaie. Truth is ſo terrible to thoſe that maintaine a falſe cauſe (as theſe vnited bretherne doe) that they dare not behold it.

Fol. 173.

After this, *this young man more reſolut and more peremptorie* goeth forvvards vvith ſecondly, thirdly, and fourthly. you lett him goe, for he being younge is toe quick of foote for you elder fellovves: purſuing his matter he putteth dovvne 3. other reaſones, of his not accepting the Archprieſt. And albeit you promiſed to conſider of the reſt of his reaſons, as before you haue touched but one and ſo haue broken your promiſe and deceiued your reader

Pag. 26.

Pag. 29. *The vnited broken their perſuis and deceiued their reders*

der that expected a greater matter at your hands, bicause *omnis promissio honesta est obseruanda.* and we Canonists doe hold that *nudum pactum producat actionem,* so that I, and other your readers may take an action against you, and call you into lavve to make you pro forme that which you haue promised vs, that is: to consider of the rest of this yong scholers reasons, or els we shalbe driuē to beleue him, and bid you fare vvell, as the second discourser said to his frend.

your reader shal be constrained to bidd you ffare vvell.

This yong scholler is *so resolute and peremptorie,* that he doth that, which you *dare not talk of,* and for the vvhich you are sorrie, *that euer any mention vvas made of it.* What is that? Mary, to sett downe simply, plainly and without shifte or fiction, the cause of this last cōtention, and the occasion of his and others vvritting. What is that? forsooth that the Iesuits or Archp. *renevved as it should seeme the slaūder of schisme in more intollerable maner then before: for novv they sayd, that vve vvere not only schismatiks but that vvhosoeuer should dogmatizando say the contrary: should incurre the cēsures of the holy church, &c. āda litle after vvhē therfore vve perceiued our late cōposed peace cōtrary to all expectatiō to be thus quickly broken, and that our good names begane to bleed a freash, the old gaules being not yet firmly cured, vve requested the Archp. &c.* Hovv say you (my vnited bretherne) is this true or

Pag. 34. 35.

M. Champeney setteth dovvne simply the cause of this last contencion.

falſe he ſaith? If true? hovv can you in conſcience defend ſo vniuſt and ruynous a cauſe? If falſe? Why doe you not confute it? Why is then not one worde at all of this in your booke? No. And vvhy? bicauſe your conſcience doth prick you *Conſcientia mille teſtes*, You confeſſe it you ſelues, for you ſay, *you vvill not talk of it, you are ſorry it vvas euer mentioned*. Hovv ſay you, had not your penne papier and inck bene better beſtowed in cõfuting this, if it be falſe, then in ſetting dovvne his. *I ſay it is no ſinne*, &c. you should haue bene better occupied alſo in confuting, as falſe the *ſix cõditions and articles* (he ſaith) *vveare on their ſide offred and propoſed to make peace and vnitie, and by your ſide reiected*: Then in ſetting dovvne either M. VVatſons common wealth Fishers memoriall and examinations, or the trouble of the Romaine colleage vvith the factions in Paris and Flanders, vvhich come as neare to this controuerſie as London to Lincolne.

you muſt confute or els confeſſe.

Pag. 33.

You quitt M. Champeney for troublinge him or his reaſons any more, bicauſe by all liklyhood you foũd his firſt to be hard of digeſtion: and you will viſitr M. I. B. his cenſures vpon Fa. Parſons letter to M. D. Bishopp. Courſe him luſtely, I vvill not lett you. But where you talk according to your cuſtome of this controuerſie vndevvly, I vvilbe bold to rencountre you. As I muſt neades ask one

queſtion of you. VVhy you doe ſo vvillingly and Franckly *lett paſſe the 21. reaſons vvhich the Cenſurer hath laid together by diſtinct nõbers to diſcredit the Protectors letters vvhich his Hol. confirmed.* You anſvveare. *VVe haue ſpoken of it before.* I ask you vvhere? here you haue forgotten your old cuſtome, vvhich vvas to ſend your reader to an other chapter. For you haue noted nothing in the margent but pag. 48. for vvhat cauſe or end, god knovveth, neither can I, or any man els iudge? but yet in th'end vvith much ſearching I haue found this before in the 2. chapt. and 18. leafe where thus you ſay: *as in one place of their booke, they goe about to shevve it to be voide and of no force by 21. fond reaſons deuiſed by thẽ ſelues vvherof no one hath any force at all.* This is your ſpoke, and therto you add, that you *are ashamed here to lay open the vanitie by more particulars.* then you haue by like done already. this then is your anſvveare to 21 reasõs which you in your margent call *Cauillations in ſtead of reasõs.* you are wellcome to the butts, hovv came this qualme ouer your ſtomack, as to take ſo great pittie of your aduerſaries as to *be ashamed to lay open the vanitie* (of their reasõs) *by more particulars.* you mey be ashamed if you haue any shame in you, of ſo shamefull an anſweare: and theſe tvvoe anſvveares are, th'one here, th'other in the 18. leafe. And why? vvhat, did you thinck that none but

Fol. 176. b Falshood.

Fol. 18.

A short anſvveare to 21. reaſons.

A sharmfull anſvveare.

beastes and dizards should read your bookes I thinck so, or els you would neuer haue handled the matter so shamefullye. Truly (my vnited bretherne) the Protector and Archp. are to giue you but litle thanckes, that taking in hand to defend them, their cause and doings, are not able to answeare one reason of 21. being as you say your selues, but fond, And that not one hath any force at all: truly then the more easye to he answeared. But like matter like Procters. The matter you haue to defend is nothing vvorth and you defend it accordingly I am sure that the simplest man or vvoman that shall read theis places, Will stay here and vvonder at your necligence or ignorance, that vvill not or cannot answvere one of 21. fond reasons of no Force at all, being *laied together by order and distinction.* yea they are laid *together to discredit the Protectors letters*, and yet you will not do so muche for the Protectors credit, as to answeare one of them. O follie, to thinck any man so madd as to imagine you to haue a good cause in hād that cannot or dare not answere one of so many reasons that are brought against you. Here in dead *Leo est in via.* But who saieth so? *Dicit piger.* yf euer there was any slouthfull and nechgent writter. you may therin beare the bel.

The Protector and Archp. doe con you litle thankes.

The Procters and the matter are a lick that is nothing vvorth

None but madd men can think you to haue a good cause.

Well: his Holl. aftervvards (say you) confirmed the Protectors letters, and therefore you lett passe the said reasons. you haue rea-

you proue heare that the Protectors letters are of no force.

ſon. If his Holl. confirmed them, then they vveare of no force before, and ſo you pleade for your diſcontented brethern, For regularly that vvhich is confirmed, vvas bebore of no force or valewe. For if it had, it should not haue neaded any confirmacion. You conclude very ſubſtantially that one *one ly reaſon of humilitie modeſtie and obedience*, would haue gotten them *more credit then* all theiſe 21. reaſons of diſobedience againſt their Superiors. I willingly yeld vnto you, if the Protector had bene their Superior? Or that you could haue proued him ſo. He then not being their Superior, you haue loſt an humble and modeſt concluſion and their 21. reaſons remaine ſtill firme and ſtable.

Fol. 167. b

An humble conclucion loſt.

Theiſe cockish, ſchollers haue me thincks ſo troubled your vnited heads and braines that you writt neither rithme nor reaſon: ād they haue ſo affrighted you vvith their reaſons, that you knovv not well on vvhich ſide to turne you. Here you should haue laboured and ſweat to haue ouerthrovvne not one, but all all their fond reaſons, and to haue proued the Cardinall to haue had ſufficient auctoritie to inſtitute the Archp. Here you should haue employed all your eloquence and powred out your skill, learning and knovvledg, in diuinitie, lawe, hiſtories, and what els, to haue proued them if not ſchiſmaticks, yet diſobedient and rebellious to god and their

Their reaſons haue troubled your vvitt.

youproffes are but title tatle.

ſuperiors. Proued (I ſay) not by a bold and baddeltatle, as you endevour, but by good & ſolid arguments and reaſons. But alas? and welladay? you yeld vp your armes, and hauing taken the foile, you giue them the victorie. For (as I haue ſaid) ſeing you are not able to confute any one of their reaſons, all reaſonable readers will iudge them to haue had good reaſon to withſtand the Inſtitucion of the Archp. by the Card. letters: and you your ſelues againſt all reaſon (not being able to anſwere to one of their 21. Reaſons) to fill their eares and feed their eies with bare words only without any reaſon. I haue often warned you and put you in mynde that this is the chief & principall pointe of this controuerſie, and if you touch not this ſtringe, you labor in vaine, to perſuade men that your diſcontented bretherne doe defend an evell cauſe, and that they be the beginners of this diuiſion and cõtenciõ. What a ſhame is it for you, to fill your booke vvith ſo much impertinent matter as you doe? and vvhẽ you come, where you hould cloſe Witth your aduerſarie, then yovv turne your back and flye, Fy, fy vppon it.

I am alſo ashamed (and ſo may all your frends and vvell willers be) to ſee an nomber of vertuous prieſtes (if you be the Authors of this Apologie) daily fighting againſt the ennemies of God and his eſpouſe for the defence of the infallible truth, ſo much to forgett them ſelues and their vocation, and to be ei-

ther ſo blinded vvith mallice againſt their bretherne, or to be carried away with inordinat affection to their parte and faction, as to committ here ſuch an exorbitant falshood as you doe in this place ſaying: *vvherin for that there is nothing ſingular from thoſe reaſones vvhich his fellovves haue alleaged before, and by vs in diuerſe partes of this Apologie haue bene examined and shevved to be either falſe or feeble, vve paſſe them ouer in this place.* You will gaine the wheatſtone I ſee well. and truly I vvill leaue it vvith you, till you shewe me where, in this Apologie, you haue *examined his fellovves reaſons*, and where you haue shevved them to be *either falſe or feeble*. This is your third *paſſe ouer* or retyring when you should ſtand *firme and ſtable*. But as often as you mention their reaſons, you *paſſe* away in ſuch poſt haſt, as in the 18. leafe, then in the 176. ād laſtly here in the 177. leafe, as that with in the compaſſe of one leafe, you make 2. *paſſe ouers*. Such haſt you make to the 12. chapt. there to defend F. Parſons from the iniurie done vnto him by your bretherne. I am content you goe, and if you had need of myne aide alſo, I would willinglie helpe you. For I proteſt I doe as much miſlike that kinde of writting as any man can doe: And in truth am glade and reioyce, when you paie them home for it.

Fol. 177. An exorbitant falshood.

The vnited haue gained the vvheatſtone.

And as for theiſe faults of yours vvhich I

That Authors intencion.

haue here noted: I take god to wittnes, I haue not done it either of Spleen or mallice, nor for that I am more on their side then on your or more their frend then yours, but being indifferent betvveene both I thought friendly to admonish you thus much, that hereby you may amend the faults. or giue me and other you frends satisfaction in shewing thē to be no faults. If you take it in euell parte, I would be full sorry for it, myne intention being by this aduertisment to deturne you rather frō the old troubles ād contenciōs, thē to giue any occasion of new sturres. Consider your states ād qualities. remenbre where you are, wherefore you are there, and amongest whom your are, and for gods sake, and the sake of the honorrble quarrel you fight for, ād for his sake vnder whose banner you fight, ād at whose hands you looke for revvarde and recompence: for theis considerations (I say) to forgiue and forgett all that is past, ioyne in vnitie vvith your bretherne, liue in loue and peace with them, gaine them by lenitie and charitable conuersation: and then god allmighti will blesse all your actiōs. To the which I pray God bring you, your bretherne, all our frends and me my self also, Amen.

FINIS.

AN ANSVVEAR OF M. DOCTOR BAGSHAW to certayne poyntes of a libell called.

An Apologie of the ſubordination in England.

A Libell lately hath been ſett out in English, called, *A brief Apologie or defence of the Catholick Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie and ſubordination in Englād, &c.* Wherein I finde the creditts of many, & of my ſelf aboue others moſte iniuriouſly impeached. Howſoeuer it be diuulged vnder the name of vnited Prieſts, it is nothing els, but a certayn narration of English matters, tolde ouer and ouer, by one Parſons a Ieſuite, in Rome, to the English ſtudents there, and by ſome of them rightly tearmed his mother Hubberds tale, as conteyning not any one thing of worth, but a fardel of Idle and boyish ſurmiſes, vntru-

thes, and detractions.

That he should vse other mens names to this *Apologie*, (vvhich hath been a former practise of his, and that somtymes perniciously, as in setting out his titles vnder the name of Dolemã,) mẽ of modesty do not so mutch vvonder, as that a mã professing himself religious, being publikly charged vvith eyght imprinted libells, of moste euill and scandalous succesſe, already, should persist in the same infamous manner of vvriting. My silence almost twenty yeares now, may testify my vnvvillingnes to handle sutch matters, more then for the necessary defence of my Good name: which, besides the former English libell, I see impugned in an other sett out in Latin, to the view of the whole world, something resembling the English, but so altered and peruerted, as by the conference of the one and the other, a man may se the vanity of bothe. Three or fovver generall imputations, vvhich the libeller vseth, I leave to other men & better opportunity to answear: as his pretended zeale for superiors, his magnificall talk against passion, his cloaking himself vnder the whole Society of Iesuits, and his vaunting of a body of Catholiks (as he tearmeth them) vnited vnto him.

His talk against disobedience and passiõ, as it onely beateth the ayre, and is obiected but of colour and course, so to be imputed to

others, by a moſt exorbitant and diſcompoſed man, doth shevv as much exceſſe of a prowde and hipocriticall humor, as defect of a good conſcience to reflect duty vppon himſelf. Of the Society of the Ieſuits, (the liking vvhereof becauſe it is an order allowed in the Churche hath been and is profeſſed by vs, &c.) I doubt not but there are many, vvhich know not, and many, vvhich vtterly diſlike of the practiſes of the libeller and his complices: and therefore he doth them no ſmall iniury and diſgrace, vvhich maketh the credit of his order a mask for his owne diſorder: ſince thoſe be *caſtra rebellium, vbi eſſe eſt mereri.* What a goodly body of Catholiks the libeller hath had to ioyn with him (by bragging vvhereof he endaungereth all whome he inuolueth.) For his ſeditious practiſes from tyme to tyme, for the procuring of M. Blakvvells authority, for the ſtirres in Flaunders, for the oppreſſion of the Romaine College, for the defaming of the ſecular Clergy of England with ſchyſme, and other ſtratagemes, vvhen iudicious men conſider, they vvill ſee (according to our prouerb,) great boaſt and ſmall roaſt, and the ranking of himſelf vvith Cardinalls and principall men of our nation, doth shew the mans humors, cõceipts, and meditations: whereas in the end he vvill marre the play, for that he ſeeth not hovv euill his acts become the ſtage.

The first particular thing agaynst me vvhich he obiecteth, is close dealing vvith the Coũsell, in his marginall note of the English but not of the Latin Epistle to his Hollines. And it is the last thing fol. 207. where he sayth. As soone as they vnderstood their tvvoe messengers were restrayned at Rome, and not like to preuayle, then Doctor Bagshaw vvas sent for from Wisbich to London to treat vvith the Councell. And what follovved? Forsoothe the remoue of twoe or three Iesuits to the Tower with daũger of their liues. A greate matter I warrant yow. And how doth all this appear? by a letter of N.N. 15. of Apr. 1599. vvho may not be named for fear. The letter is cyted fol. 150. conteyning fower coniecturall surmises, all foolish, and the twoe first grounded vpon playne vntruthes.

For the first. The day (sayth he) after D. Bagshavv vvas gone, the Minister of the tovvne comming into the Castle, sayd, that D. Bagshavv tolde him, that he looked to be remooued ere it vvere long: & therefore it is thought he vvas cause of his ovvne remooue. First, I vvill not except against the testimony of a Minister whome this letter-maker vvould make to vtter a secret, if not an vntruthe, because I know him, and diuers others of that towne, to be of such moral honesty and sincerity as in that respect they vvould haue nothing to do vvith the Iesui-

ticall faction, as hauing often by others and themſelues experienced their perverting & deprauing mens ſpeeches. Then if I had told him I expected my Remooue, (as I neuer did for I did not once think of it) he & the whole tovvne knew, that I might haue doubted my Remooue, becauſe it vvas threatned frō one of the Iuſtices, fourteen dayes before, falling out with me vpon matter of diſputation in Religion. Agayn, I had Receaued a letter, (which is well knowne, & vvas a great meanes to declare myne innocency to the LL. of the Councel,) that I should look to my ſelf, for that there was a plott layd to ouer throvv me, by the English Spaniolized practiſers. So that the firſt is but a falſe grovvnd, and a malitious inference. And ſo is the ſecōd, that I should ſend M. Bluet vvord, my ſending for vvas, concerning certayn matters, vvhich vve had talked of, &c. For clean contrary, I being debarred to vvrite at all, or ſpeak but in the hearing of the Purſuiuant, ſent M. Blu. word, that he should not greeue himſelf, with deuiſing, vvhat the cauſe of our trooble is: for that he could neuer perfectly knovv it, vntill I, or ſome which were priuy to it, did vtter it vnto hī. For the third, M. Archers vvords are not worth the ſpeaking of, nor his Remooue a matter vvorth three ſtravves one way or other. for the laſte, if there vvere a falſe brother in Wisbich it

might be assoone the vvriter of this letter as any other and perhapps sooner. Are not heer accusatiõs, proofs, and witnesses passing suta-ble? Ar not these goodly authéticalls where-of the libeller so much braggeth? But to omitt these bibble babbles.

My first dealing (as the libeller scoffingly tearmeth it) with the Councell was to defend the honor of our Religion, and euen vvith suffering torments, to declare mine innocen-cy vvhich was brought into great doubt, spe-cially by one Anfield, seruant to F. Parsons & after a Pursuiuant. My second dealing with the Councell vvas, to shevv my self guiltles of an horrible treason, layd to Squire and his fellovves: vvho auerred the contriuer, moo-uer, and vrger therof to be one Walpool a Ie-suit, subordinate (as the other English Iesuits are, if F. Parsons say true,) to the sayd Par-sons. How farre he is to be charged vvith sub-orning or concurring vvith the one, his ser-uant, or the other his subiect, I leaue to the due place of discussion. It is vvell knovvne to many, and some of great honor (men vvith-out exception) can testifye in my troble a-bout Squire, that the Earle of Essex vvas sent from the Queen, to take order for my com-mitting to the Tower. And M. Wade, whome novv the Iesuits make so fauorable to me & others, vpon the first information giuen a-gainst me, wrote to the Earle of Essex and M.

Secretary, that there was no vvay to deale vvith me but with extremity: although afterward he changed his mynde whē the matter diſguiſed probably at firſt, vvas afterwards better opened. Novv vvhat a pregnant coniectural head hath this libeller, vvho writeth, that I procured myne ovvne ſending for to London, to treat vvith the Councel? And vvherfore forſooth? For that vve vnderſtood, the tvvoe meſſengers ſent to Rome vvere impriſoned, &c. That year vvith the libeller vvent backvvard, as the ſunn did in Achabs Dyall, or elſe he folyshlye profeſſed the arte of lyinge, hauinge ſo vveake a memorie. My apprehenſion was in the beginning of October, and theirs in Rome vvas in December after. Whereof the libeller should haue had good cauſe to haue ſome Remembrance for he knovveth that amonge a number of tales of the like qualitye and truthe he tolde the tvvoe Prieſts, that I had a pēſiō of the Queen of England: vvhich was but the ordinary allovvance to cloſe priſonners, but that it pleaſeth his looſe tongue, to vſe ſuch inſultations and indignityes. Therefore by putting ſuch a fovvle, groſſe, and palpable vntruthe for the firſt accuſation, (the firſt in euery order of things being the meaſure of others,) a man may gheſſe of the reſt. And I vvishe the libeller in due fear may vvay, hovv abhominable to God *pondus & pondus is*, (as the vviſe

man ſayth) a vvaygh t and a vvaygh t. My Remooue from Wisbich vvas (ſayth he) a preferment to the Queens penſion: and yet the remooue of Ieſuits from Wisbich, having the ſame allovvance, vvas no preferment but a detriment. If the libeller had had any true zeal of the honor of God and Religion, he should haue vvished the remooue of the Ieſuited from Wisbich. Their ſeparatiō there had made the greateſt ſcandall, that vvas giuen in this tyme: vvhereof no cauſe could be imputed to the vnited Prieſts, vvhich continued as before, vvithout the leaſt innouation. The Catholiks had vvritten thither that they had rather haue ſuſteyned death of their bodyes, then ſuch an offence to ſoules. Some of them had com thither, and vpon their knees requeſted F. Weſton, for the honor of God, to deſiſt from ſo ſcandalouſe an enterpriſe, and being diſcontented vvith his inſolēt anſvvear, vvent avvay deteſting pride and faction. Some of the temporall Magiſtrates had tolde them to their faces, that Ieſuitiſme from a *ſerpigo* vvas becom a *gangrena*, and therefore to be cutt of: and the keeper had longe before my trooble ſovvght to remooue ſome for theire ſeditiousneſſe. Their Agency and conſiſtoriall common wealth was often hādled by Miniſters in pulpets, to the great diſgrace of Catholik Religion. Their ſeditious and diſorderly beha-

uiour vvas ſuch, that not onely the Iuſtices in commiſſion diſliked them but euen ſome youths of the tovvne of Wisbich, ſcattered abroad, & offered to iuſtify moſt diſgracefulvvritings againſt them: Grieuous accuſations had been vttered againſt ſome of them, by three vvoemen their proſelites, vvhereof enſevved examinations, Rumors of indightments, expectation of arraygnments terrors to them ſelues, troobles to the quiet, and diſcontent of all iuditious Catholiks. In vvhich caſe ſome of the Ieſuited offering vvith mony to procure their ovvne Remooue, (vvhether vpon shame or Remorſe God he knovveth,) Gods iuſtice may appear, in that the book of titles made for the aduancement of the English Ieſuited, and turned in their Remooue to their diſgrace and daunger, ſome of them being principally called into queſtiō for thoſe titles, and the cunning plott of ſuborning Squire and others, ſerued to bring to paſſe, that the tovver vvhich vvas intended for me and others vvas aſſigned othervviſe, and the politik canuaſers fel into the pitt, vvhich thēſelues had digged for others. Another cauſe of cloſe dealing vvith the Coūcel, the libeller imagineth to haue bin, to informe them that the ſubordination was not for Religion, but for ſtate practiſe: and by likelyhood ſome promiſe to them that it should not ſtand. For M. Blackvvels titles

vvhether they vvere begon for God, or for God shall be ended, God in his iudgement and fitt time vvill descrye. I knovve one much Iesuited signified to the Counsell his likinge of M. Blackvvills authoritye the rather becavse it should not be displeasing to the Councell for that it tended onlye to the taking awaye of facultyes and so consequetlye to the hinderinge of reconciliation, which in time might be the ouerthrowe of religion. For other dealing vvith the Councel about him, I am ashamed of the vnworthines of the libeller vvhich himself discouereth. What vvant of modesty is it to blase such false and foolish narration? What indiscretion to abuse the name of the Councel about such toyes? It is well knowne if it pleased God so to moue their honorable vvisdomes, they could ridde England of all the Iesuited vvith lesse labour, then the libeller bestowed in this his paltry Rapsody, and vvith lesse adoe then was my Remoove from Wisbich to London. But vvhat fear doth a vvicked conscience cary vvith it? Allane late Cardinall of vvorthy memory in his Apologie of the Seminaryes, fol. 71. vvriteth. We protest, that neither the Re. Fathers of the Society of the holy name of Iesus, vvhome the people call Iesuits, (an expresse clause being in the instructiõs of their mission into England, that they deale not in matters of state, vvhich is to be shevved, sig-

ned vvith their late generalls hand of worthy memory,) neither the Priests either of the Seminaryes, or others, haue any commissiō, instruction, or insinuation from his Holines, or any other their superior either in Religion, or of the Colleges, to moove sedition, or to deal against the state or temporall gouernment. Fa. Parsons himself also vvriteth in his answear to S. Fran. Hastings fol. 71. in the third person: So then Fa. Parsons protesteth, (as I am credibly informed,) that he vvas neuer consenting, vvitting, vvilling, inducing, yelding, or priuy to any (such) personal attēpt against her Maiesty in his life. Parsons In the supplication to the Queen made by one Iesuit for all the rest and they all subiect to Fa. Parsons, is not shee tearmed mose mighty, most mercifull, most feared, best beloued Princesse, the shott anchor of all their iust hopes, perfect in all princely duty, sacred Maiesty and vvhat not? Is not protestation made vnto her that they vvill yeeld and persvvade in conscience all tēporall obedience, and take her parte euen against the Popes army? In this libell, is not Fa Parsons made a most free and innocent man from treasons, neuer touched, neuer named in the arraygnment of any? And doth not M. Blakvvell himself in one of his decretalls forbid bookes made against the state? Nay goeth he not further and chargeth M. Mushe and his con-

ſortes that they be medlers in ſtate matters? Is it not a common obiection againſt the ſecular Cleargy that they goe about to bring the king of Scotland to the crovvne of England being an Heretik? Doth not Fa. Parſons ſay that M. Doctor Bishop. and M. Charnock vvith their aſſociats were found to be Scotish in faction? And in this libell is not M. Watſon ſayd to be ſent by the ſecular Prieſts to the king of Scotland? And are not vve charged that vve are to deal vvith the king of Fraunce to ſubiect England vnto him? After ſuch proteſtation, ſuch zeale for the ſtate, ſuch charging of others, did any fear remaine in the libeller that he should not be beleeued? Would any man think that the opinion of tvvoe or three Prieſts could ſway vvith the Councel or mooue any thing, and that againſt the libeller and his body of Catholiks? No no the libeller knoweth well ynough the great vigilancy, experience, and iudiciouſnes of the Councell in ſtate matters. It is well knovvne that Fa. Parſons in Englād after contrary Proteſtatiō firſt made, and that vnder his obedience to farre and foolishly dealt in ſtate matters, that ſome principall Catholiks ſent him vvorde to departe the realme for othervviſe they would deliuer him to the temporal magiſtrate. And this is the true cauſe of his departure which the libel would ridiculouſly colour

that he might be freed from being thought to be a renegado. His cariage ſince (vvhich particulerly hath been propoſed befor competent iudges) hath been ſutable to that worſhipfull perſwaſion vvhich he vſed at Rome to the ſtudents there, that they should haue at ſtate and all: for with ſtate medling they could but dy, and dy they should if they were taken vvithout ſtate medling.

Now after all his turmoyles, browilleryes, libells, attempts, and inuaſions ended with shame and confuſion, to retayn ſtill his body of Catholicks in good opinion of him (a fevv God knoweth, whereof ſome are ſyncere with ſcrupulous ignorance, and others very factious vvith partiall preiudice) he telleth thé an olde ſtale tale of cloſe dealing with the Councel which in very truthe being tolde in plain tearmes is this, he muſt ſtrike & we may not warde: he muſt accuſe, and vve may not defend: he muſt irritate againſt religion, and we may not pacifie: he muſt falſely pretend and by pretending diſgrace the Catholick fayth, and we may not ſyncerely cleer it: he muſt expoſe as much as in him lyeth our prince to diſtruction, our country to inuaſiō, our friends and our ſelues to ſlaughter, our profeſſion to contempt and maledictiō, and vve may not refuſe to receaue his woūds in our whole body. But ſince his ouerweening of him ſelf is ſo great, let him aſſure him ſelf that vvhat lo-

yaltly he deceiptfully proteſteth, vvevvill dutifully performe againſt all trayterous practizers vvhatſoeuer. It is ſo far from vs to be afrayd of dealing vvith the Councell wherein we haue and vvill alwayes vſe ſyncerity that vve think he had little vvitt vvhich did obiect it, himſelf being charged to haue dealt moſt diſhoneſtly vnderhand in that kinde ād we vvould count it the greateſt earthly benefit vvhich could happen to vs, if the LL. of the moſt honorable Councell vvould deal with vs for the building vp of that which this libellet hath to his power ruined.

And in this point, not onely our better warrant, but the infinit leuity of the libeller may appear, who alwayes maketh Cardinall Allen his copeſmate, and in his table of men abuſed by vs hath put him in the ranck. Now let any indifferent mā of commō ſence iudge whether he be abuſed by thoſe which ſeek to credit his proteſtation before mentioned, to followv his direction, and to imitate his quiet & Apoſtolicall courſe, or by thoſe that by their ſeditious ſhufflings haue made his proteſtation to be thought perfidious, and by thinking them ſelues ſomebody, vpon emulatiō haue runne another cleā cōtrary courſe to that vvhich he did. And for further marke of the ſame ridiculous vanity in his Catalogue, the moſte reuerend Bishop of Tricanica novv Nuncius in the Lovv countryes is

put in as disobeyed by vs and refused to be iudge of our cõtrouersyes. This is not only a notorious ly, but the clean contrary is true. He hauing his instructions and commission for England from the Pope himself, in his letters to the secular clergy vvilleth them so to comport them seluesas they doe not irritate the temporall state. Doe vve or the Iesuits disobey in this point? And the lyke might be sayd of euery other point if opportunity serued and pacience in men to hear such illimited & audacious boldenes in vttering vntruthes as this libeller vseth. One point further I vvould not omitt. The same Bishop tolde me and others and vvilled vs to intimate it to our countrymen, that in the Spanish inuasiõ in the year 1588. vvhen all English asvvell Catholicks as others vvere designed to slaughter, the Pope had no intereſt, no he vvas not so much as priuyco the particuler circumstãces of that design. If any man compare this spoken of his credit vvith the booke published that year in the name (vsurped as may be thought) of the Cardinall and other semblable pamphlets since vvherein the libeller hath been a speciall stickler he shall see in a principall point of our difference, who be the abusers of the Pope and his Nuncius, Cardinall Allen, and others?

That is pleaseth therefore this goodly libeller to tearme our actions treacherous, he

shevveth vvhat be his ovvne, by vvhich he vvould measure other mens. And vvhereas he likeneth M. Bluet and others to Alcimus and Simon in the bookes of the Machabees, vve hope in God the iust iudge of all men, that in tyme vve shall haue satisfaction, and in the mean vvhile vve make not our selues better then the vvhole army of the liuing God, which by his permission vvas exprobrated by an vncircumcized and bastardly Philistim.

An appendix of state matters is the incurring of the lavv of premunire vvherein vnnecessarily, vnprofitably, and most daungerously the libellers faction inuolued them selues and their abettors, and are discontented that we auoyded it our selues & vvarned others. And in this point the libeller pleaseth himself in retorting a dilemma against our association. For answere may it please him to knovv that the Agency of F. Weston in Wisbich inuolded him and all his abettors vvithin the premunire, according to the iudgment of many and namely of M. Doctor Windham, a most excellent and renowmed lavvyer. And it is admirable, that any men should so farre be giuē ouer to their ovvne sence, as for pride vvithout any shadovv at the least good vnder heauen, they should infolde them selues and their friends in such dangerous statutes, and there is no doubt but vvyse men vvill looke to the causer of these inconueniences.

The association as it vvas wholly to haue bin referred to the good liking of his Holinesse, and vvas grounded vppon such syncere indifferency as the Iesuits aboue hand were fayn to commẽd it, so it should haue bin vvithout any cause of exasperating or dislike of the temporall state, and so the often repeated satyricall ãd false surmises against it, are grownded vppon emulation and passion, vvithout reasõ & iudgemẽt. And it vvas well prouided in the rules of the association, that vve in prisõ should haue no authority: that it might be seen vve sought the common good and not of our selues. And vvhereas he cyteth a letter of myne Fol. 64. to say the Agency in Wisbich vvas vvithout title, place, and superiority, it is a fitton.

The thing it self sheweth that vppon ambitiõ and emulation (for they sayd they were not honored enough) they ouerthrew the credit of one of the moste famous places in Europe. The introduction and grownd of the rest was an Epistle vvhich 18. of thẽ vvrote to Fa. Gar. beginning, *Cõtulimus ab heri & nudius tertius &c.* In the English Apol. it is maymed, and in the latin in the first Catalogue of fraudes Num. 14. that parte vvhich is left out is sayd to be an imposture of others ascribed vntruely to the 18. I did vvonder, at the lightnes & folly of the libeller vvhen I savv the tvvoe Catalogues, the one of frau-

des, the other of men abuſed, ſett before the Libell. Scarce a true vvorde is in either of them, and many notorious vntruthes, but this denying of parte of their epiſtle, is to beare the bell. The letter in the firſt true edition is turned into English (as I hear) vvith a commentary, and is intituled *Epiſtola prima obſcurorum virorum.* And I knovve ſome vvho at the ſight of it at the beginning ſayd, they vvould neuer conſort with the Ageniſts for the abſurdity of that letter. It may be novv they ſee they ſpoke truer then they vvould vvhen they affirmed Fat. VVeſton to be a paralytik in his bed not able to vvalke, *in via Iuſtorum,* in the way of the Iuſt. And they muſt needes perceiue that the remedy for him vvas as ridiculous and puppish as their conceipt, that they vnriled the hovvſe and lett him dovvne in a couch before his Superior. And if he had bin a vvhole man, yet he vvalked another way then his ſuperior preſcribed ſince. His letter to me is auouched vvherein he ſaythe he vvas neither author, nor counſaylor, nor approuer of the ſeparation. And it may be they ſee vvhen men perceiue by their ovvne confeſſion, they pulled of the tyles of the hovvſe, they may doubt whether they intended not to pull dovvne all the reſt. When I ſavv ſo egregious an vntruthe and deniall of a thing moſte notorious in the beginning, ad

all the reſt ſutable (a very bundle of lyes) I determined to referre men to the English natration of wisbich matters, vvhich hath vpō neceſſity ſparingly ſett out ſome things, though it hath paſſed many other worthy the knowing. Tvvoe vntruthes may not be vntouched proceeding of ſplene and malice, to obfuſcate the eſtimation of tvvoe Prieſts, the one dead the other aliue. The dead is M. Doctor Norden vvho vvith me is made to haue drawen M. Bluett to oppoſition againſt Fath. Weſton, and ſo to haue cauſed the diſſention. Beſides that M. Bluett is of that vvorthineſſe, vertue and iudgmēt, that he vvould be drawn to nothing but that vvhich is right: it is notoriouſly knovvne that the ſeparation vvas made before D. Norden came. His diſlike of it proceeded from many cauſes, vvhereof one vvas: the night before he came to the caſtle, remayning in Wisbych tovvne vvith his keeper of London from vvhence he vvas remooued, one of the ſeparators (vvhoſe name I ſpare) vvrote him a letter conteyning the names and prayſes of the ſeparators, and ſundry detractions againſt thoſe vvhich kept their former vnity, and a perſuaſion to him therefore to be one of the ſeparation. The next day for fear he ſhould be ſearched, he burnt the letter before he came to be priſoner in the Caſtle. In proceſſe of tyme ſeing many the like vnprieſtly trickes of the ſepa-

rators, he grevv to great diſlike and open plain reprehenſion of them, eſpecially for that they ſpoke and vvrote euill of others, alleaging among other proofes the letter Written to himſelf. The party vvho vvrote it knovving it to be burnt, denyed it in ſuch ſorte that D. Norden affirming it vppon his Prieſthood, charged the other to be a flatt Atheiſt. Many ſuch things he charged the Ieſuited vvith, as F. Weſton himſelf and Archer, vvith auerring and defending the ſtevves to be as lavvfull as the Pope himſelf, the denial of vvhich propoſitions in this Apology is ſo vvithout the compas of humane modeſty, as it ſeemeth a very league vvith hell againſt truthe and honeſty, for ſaluing the credit of F. Weſton and his complices: a ſtrange and marueillous kinde of death muſt be aſcribed to D. Norden, vvho yet as he had euer liued honeſt and ſyncere, ſo he dyed in priſon for the confeſſion of his fayth of an Appoplexy, in quiet and Chriſtian manner, referring his cauſe to be diſcerned by God betvvixt him and his factious detractors, vvho are not content onely to rake in all the cannels of the liuing, but needes muſt be ranſaking the graues of the departed, vvho if they cannot diſcommend, yet vvill conceale, or as much as they can diſſemble due commendations. In the booke to his Holineſſe in diſcribing the ſtirres of Wisbich it is ſayd: *There came a*

certain prieſt to bring almes to the impriſoned, &c. In the firſt Catalogue of the latin booke. Num. 18. Theſe prayſes are ſayd to be giuen to M. Mush. If it vvere a miſtaking to putt M. Mush for M. Doleman, it vvere a ſtrange boldneſſe of him that would write any thing out of the authenticalls (as he calleth them) ſo much to erre in the narration of one of the chiefeſt points of the matter: and by this one may ſee what wiſe information the author of the Apologie had, and what creditt is to be giuen to all the reſt of his tale. If it were of purpoſe (as othervviſe it vvas a dull ouerſight) it could not be leſſe then enuy againſt M. Dolman, a man as it is vvell knovvne of ſingular ſollicitude tovvards afflicted Catholicks, and of long tyme a ſpeciall prouider for priſoners, in vvhich reſpect he vvas and is a great moate in the Ieſuits way, which are ſayd to ſeeck themſelues and not Chriſte or his. The mention of M. Dolman is made in the booke to the Pope, to shevv Gods prouidēce in ſending him to Wisbich ſo opportunely, to be an Arbiter of the ſeperation, vvho vvas a man beſydes his rare charity of ſuch experience iudgement and ſyncerity as none fitter could haue been choſen, whereby the peruicacity of the ſeperated may more be conuinced, vvho vvould not deſiſt at the compaſſionate per-

perſuaſion and teares of ſo vvorthy a man, nor for the aduice of other excellent men vvhom he had conferred vvithall, nor at the laſte as they had promiſed (at his vndertaking the arbitrement at their requeſtes) before and vndertaken and vvere in conſcience bound vpon his ſentence giuen that they could not go forvvard vvithout ſinne. And therefore no maruayle though the libeller vvould haue that ſeem to be ſpoken of M. Mushe, vvhich could be ment of none but M. Dolman. The vvhole narration no leſſe foolish then maliciouſe, I leaue to any indifferent and Chriſtian iudgement. At the cloſe I am charged vvith a contradiction for vvriting to Father Garnet in commendation of Father Weſton, vvhome elſvvhere I reprehend. The truthe vvas, Father Garnet commaunded Fa. Weſton (vvho had been cauſe of much troobles and ſcādalls) ſo that there might be a formed peace to deſiſt from his Agency in his letters to me, my ſelf M. Mush and M. Dudley dealt vvith him, he vrged the making of ſome rules which he thought could neuer haue been procured, yet they were contented vnto. That vvay being deceaued he pretended a great deſire of reconciliation vvhich he knevv to be difficult, conſidering the iniuryes and detractions proceeding from him and his, to the preiudice of the others, yet vvith great difficulty we obtayned

conſent of remiſſiō of priuate iniuryes: being thus alſo fruſtrated he aſſembled his party & tolde them he hoped they would not leaue him, for he vvould not leaue them: ſome of the vviſer anſwered, the ſcandall of their ſeparation vvas ſo great, as they would returne to their former vnity, and without him of he would not. Being thus driuen from all hope of retayning his dominion, he deſired that he might haue the credit of perſwading his partye to reunite them ſelues by making to them an exhortation, in pronouncing where of he fell downe amongſt them, and at the firſt was thought to be dead: howſoeuer the libeller would haue it thought to be a fiction, which is a manifeſt ſigne of want of honeſty and grace in the libeller. At length after many tergiuerſations, a tyme and place, was appoynted for the reuniting of all agayn. In which aſſembly F. Weſton to giue example came firſt to M. Bluet and vpon his knees deſired the forgiuing and forgetting of things paſt. After he came to me and others, which example the reſt mutually followed. Vppon this occaſion I wrote in his commendation, thinking then that he had deſired this reconciliation vnfaynedly as others I knovv did, from which he was ſo farre that his party had dealt before hand and vnderhand With M. Mush and M. Dudley for the ground of a nevv breach. If I vppon iuſt occaſion miſli-

ked F. Weſton, yet vpon beleef of his humility and charity vvas content to commẽd him to his ſuperior and others, vvith deſire of abolishing the memory of all vnkindenes, what shallovv vvitt hath the libeller to make me contradict my ſelf? At the making of the ſeperation they did make great proteſtations that they did not make the leaſt exceptions againſt any mans behauiour. We knevv thẽ to be falſe and vrged ſepetation from men for pretended faults to ſauour of Donatiſme: and novv the libeller vttereth the contrary to their proteſtations. VVhich party is guitly we referre to euery chriſtian to iudge by this that to counteruayle their vnprieſtly paſquils we ſent to the Pope for a viſi-atiõ of Wisbich. F. Parſons intercepted our letters and ſo hindered it, vvhich vvas not onely an iniury to vs labouring to declare our innocencyes, but one of the great abuſes & indignityes vvhich he hath offered to the Sea Apoſtolik, vve for forming our conſciences and ſatisfying the vvorld, ſought to the Pope for diſcuſſion and reformation, they audaciouſly impeached it. And further to trooble the vvater diuulge to the vvorld one Fishers confeſſion. I vvould fayn knovv vvhat thing vvere ſo abſurd vvhich the libeller vvould not take holde of vvhen he cyteth him vvhome vvithall he diſcrediteth? When Fisher came into England he voluntarily ſett dovvne in vvriting

the affayres in Rome as they had paſſed betwixt the Ieſuits and the ſtudents. Notvvithſtanding it imported that the ſtudents should haue bin cleared of thoſe deteſtable infamyes vvhich Harvvood and other ſuch bad fellovves had rayſed, it being vvritten and bruyted that for extream euill behauiour they vvere diſciplined in the open ſtreetes. And this vvas it fol. 81. For vvhich he ſayth one vvas derided and miſcalled, giuing good and ſpirituall Councell, vvhich was indeed a perſwaſion to one to beleeue the moſt horrible ſlaunders rayſed againſt the English ſtudents in Rome. yett vvere Fishers vvritings cõcealed, vntill vnexpectedly a ſearch cauſed by a vvicked ſeruant and occaſioned by ſome indiſcretion of one Ieſuited they vvere brought to knovvledg. A memoriall (they ſay) he cauſed to be exhibited to the Pope, and fol. 97. He had letters vvritten by me, intituled. *Copia literarum Catholicorum in Anglia degentium.* Why was it not giuen vpp, and the authors conuented if they could not haue iuſtifyed their complaints. If it vvas giuen to the Pope as the Ieſuits vvrote in England, why did they procure letters of commendatiõs from men (ſome vertuous indeed as S. Fr. Ingleſield & others, but vninformed, credulous, & many tymes for priuate intereſt partialized) to ſtop the courſe of Iuſtice? Whye did they by euill meanes extort letters

from ſome vvho novv repent theyre vvritinge? in vvhat place of the vvorld was it euer held for a lavvfull manner of proceeding to elude ſufficient teſtimony againſt one in a criminall cauſe, by procuring hands in commendation of the accuſed, and from ſuch many tymes, as doe not knovv him, ād yet muſt teſtify generall negatiues, againſt law, and the light of reaſon? The libeller confeſſeth, my letters among others vvere intercepted, and thereby diſcouereth himſelf vvho he is, for that he auerreth them to be foorth comming, vvhich, (with Gods grace) before a due tribunall vvill be diſcuſſed, vvhether letters ſent to the Pope, and inquiſition, may be intercepted. That is a ſtale ſhift, vvhich he bringeth, for my letters vvritten to the ſtudents, that they vvere deliuered to ſome in Millane, and the libeller moſt diſhoneſtly ād falſely affirmeth, that they vvere ſeditiouſe: vvhereas indeed they vvere contrarily, to perſuade the ſtudents to peace and patience, and to leaue reuenge to God, to vvhome it did belong. For that I euer neglected priuate vvrongs, in reſpect of publik ſcandalls: although in his ſence euery thing is ſeditious, vvhich is not fitted to his humor: vvhich is no leſſe then to call good euill, ād euill good, vvhich as vertuous and moderate men condemne, ſo hath it anexed from God a malediction.

This Fisher at his comming to Rome was brought to the Colledge, and imprisoned vnder the custody of the common iaylor, for that office he executeth, and as it seemeth affecteth. Being in close keeping (as I of certain knowledg doe knovv he himself relateth it & promiseth to iustify before his Hollinesse) Once for a shevv Acarisius came to examin him, but ordinarily his keeper Fa. Parsons offering to put hott Irons to his armes, if he would not cõfesse what he would haue him. These tymes God hath reserued vs into, wherein our English College foũded by our kings for the good of our country, should be possessed by those vvho make it a place of imprisonment and torture. A number of sheets of paper vvere vvritten of tales, surmises, and incoherent lyes, vvhich is one of the most principall authenticalls of the libeller. And if there vvere nothing else, that is a sufficient discouery of the packing of Fishers confession, and of much malice else, that he maketh him, fol. 96. to say, he vvas principally commended to M. Christ. Bagshaw, M. Robert Dolman, and M. Iohn Collington. And yett must needs this vvorthy vvorke be printed in disgrace of those, vvho are tovvched with Fishers confession. If Fishers reports be of any credit, the libeller and his Rovvte be arrand honest men. If they be of no credit the publishing of them deserueth

a furred capp. Among other narrations of Fishers, a number of incoherent fooleryes, collected vnder his name, one is of some great familiarity which he saw betvvixt some of vs in Wisbich, and the keeper, and also the keepers vvife. A detractiō according to their custome generall, sovvnding bigg, and a toy in particular discussion. The libeller hath very bad luck in his Chronology, for M. Medley our keeper his wife was a very olde vvoman, and dead some years before Fisher came to Wisbich, yet his cunning is to hurt by a confused suspicion if he can, and no man in particular shalbe able to vrge satisfaction. I could haue vvished for the honor of Religion, the libeller had not vvith so much vntruthe and improbability, corraded such base shew of matter against men of knovvne integrity, for that it discouereth very bad dispositions in himself (and many things dayly begin to be imputed to his complices, I hear more and more) the displaying vvhereof if hereafter it grieue him and them, they must thank themselues, and haue the amends in their hands. I haue heard (and truly dissvvaded) some threatning such publication, and I could vvish that the libeller with Harwood & all the rest of the pack of detractors, vvere vvith their accusations remitted to Gods iudgemēt, if it vvere not preiudiciall to their soules vvhich is much to be feared. One de-

uiſe vvith Fisher is not to be omitted. After Fa. Parſons had made him ſay and vnſay vvhat he vvould haue him, he cauſed him (being ſtill garded by ſome of his creatures) to come before ſome of the ſtudents, and tell them in ſolemne earneſt, of his knowledge, that the ſtirres in the Romane Colledge againſt the Fathers vvere cauſed by the Councell of England, and therefore to be abhorred. Whereby may be ſeen vvhat vviſe opinions he vvould imprint in our vertuous youthes, vvhat auerſion he beareth and bewrayeth to the ſtate of England, vvhich others ſought to haue concealed, and vppon what grounds he chargeth men vvith dealing vvith the Councell. And yet this ſerued him for a principall grownd to vvrite into Spayn, that the English ſtudents were alienated from the king of Spayn vntill he came to Rome and altered them. By which and a number of like ſhifts and ſurquedryes, he hath abuſed both England and Spayn, which in due tyme here after may come to the light and laughter of the worlde. And becauſe in the Latin libell he maketh the Councel, or I know not what enemyes, beginners of the diſcontents and garboyles in Rome, and vvould dravv a certayn cohærence of the late ſtirres vvith things which fell out in my tyme, and maketh me expelled thence by the Cardinalls ovvne hands vvhereof I neuer heard before.

I redd the libell nor know not now vvhat it meaneth. I muſt ſay ſomething of my departure out of Rome. Although to be expelled thence, or from any place for that vvhich he calleth ſedition, be to be counted I doubt not reputatiõ and merit, (which if he had or durſt haue explicated in particuler vvhat he meaneth by ſeditiõ,) would more eaſily appear. For any act or worde of myne in Rome or els vvhere let him obiect vvhat he can, I giue him leaue, & in iuſt defence of myne honor, I defy all ſuch contemptible companions, as ſhall any vvay oppoſe themſelues againſt it. But to clear the myſts which he caſteth. Being made Prieſt in Fraunce, with that freedome and reſolution for England, with which many excellent and innocent Prieſts had bin made before, I went to Rome, to viſit that holy and renowned place, with leaue and aduice of the late Cardinall Allen of happy memory, to ſtay or return according to myne owne liking, for vvhich and many other fauours I was ſingulerly beholding to that mã. At my firſt cõming to Rome, ſeing the ſtate of the Colledge, the number of the diſcontented, and that for notoriouſe iniuryes, I determined to return agayn with the firſt opportunity. Which reſolution I vvould neuer after alter, amõg many other cauſes, for that I had gotten the Italian payn in the breſt in taking the ſpirituall exerciſe in the Romane

Colledge for vvhich I vvas driuen for a tyme to liue in our vinyeard, and vſe other meanes of recouery, but all in vayn, for which and other cauſes, Cardinall Allen wrote vnto me to come into Fraunce. Whileſt I was expecting opportunity of returning, D. Levvis Bishop of Caſſana came to Rome, and lay in the College, vſing often conference with me about English matters. Fa. Agazarius knovving moſte of the ſtudents to dislike his proceedings, and doubting that he should be driuen out of the hovvſe (vvhich fell out immediately after in Sixtus Quintus his tyme vpon a viſitation vvhich was procured after my departure, vvherin M. D. Ely hath bin misinformed, as though I had bin one of the procurers of that viſit) dealt vvith me very earneſtly, that I vvould reſolue to ſtay and be intirely vnited with the Fathers. My anſwear to him and others vvas ſtill reſolute for departure. The fashion of the Ieſuits is to haue one vvhoſe name they may vſe for their diſignes, to the end things laudible may be attributed to themſelues, and things diſcommendable to him. So vvas Cardinall Caietane for their matters of England, and ſo vvas at that tyme Cardinall Boncompagno, vvhom vvith no credit to himſelf (to ſay the leaſt) the libeller nameth, nor vvith honor to the Cardinall, but that he vvould play ſmale game rather then ſitt out. The Cardinall

asked me vvhether I vvould ſtay, and I tolde him no, the Cardinall ſayd then I should reſolue to departe, I anſvvered rather that day preſent then the next. After this vvhē I came to the Pope himſelf of bleſſed memory Gregory the 13. he moued my ſtay vnto me, I anſvvered his Holines, I had a firm reſolutiō to go to my country, vvhere vppon he diſmiſſed me vvith the reſt, vvith moſt fatherly vvordes and affection, and graunted all the requeſts vve propoſed vnto him. And F. Agazarius gaue ſuch teſtimony to me and others then departing vnder his hand and the College ſeale, vvhich is yet extant to be ſeen, as if the libeller had vievved it, call he ſedition vvhat he liſt (his calling not being vvorth a blevv point) he vvould confeſſe our expulſion (if any had bin) to be moſt iniurioufe, & vvith no aduantage to the libeller remembred. The records of the College be nothing but foolish partiall vvreſting and reporting of things according to priuate humors, vvhich is at length grovvne to that narration of mother Hubberd, vvhich I remembred in the beginning. Within the compaſſe of vvhich ſince, he vvill needes dravv his departure out of Oxon, the conference of one parte vvith another vvill diſcouer the whole. For. Parſons his departure out of Oxon he relleth a tale vvithout head or feet that becauſe he vvould haue punished on M. Iames Hau-

ley his owne ſcholler for going to a play, I ioyned vvith the Proteſtant party, vvhoe vvould needs throw him and all his out of the College the ſame night, except he would yeald to departe. If he had not a marueilous conceypt of his ovvne vvitt, he vvould not vtter ſuch narrations, not onely voyd of ſubſtance but of all probability or colour of truthe. Long tyme he hath bin ſuffered to reporte, that he was putt out of Oxon for his Religion, vvith ſome touch of credit to me and others, vntill at length his exorbitant grating vpon euery one vvho ſtood in his way, gaue ſome occaſion by ſome inſinuatiō of the truthe to giue him a caueat, not to be ſo ſawcy in medling vvith other mens matters, and ſo farr ſo forget his ovvne imperfections.

True it is that M. Squier did not li[illegible] M. Parſons, but that he did obiect any particuler matter againſt him is ſo farre from truthe, that he made proteſtation to the contrary. For Religion M. Parſons then did profeſſe himſelf a Proteſtant and that vvith ſuch affectation, as he dealt with M. Squire for direction in the ſtudy of diuinity, and cōferred ordinarily in the reading of Caluin with M. Hyde, a fellow in the hovvſe, a knowne Caluiniſt, but othervviſe learned and a very morall Gentleman. Yea being burſar he had diſfurnished the College library of many aun-

cient bookes, and rare manusſcripts (and of ſome of them as is thought dishoneſtly) and in their ſteed brought in a number of Hereticall bookes the firſt that euer were there vvhich yet remayn for an argument of his want of Religion, and for a corraziue to his conſcience vvhyleſt he liueth. The reſoluteneſſe of ſome of the fellovves to be ridd of him vvas ſuch, that they had prouided the tolling of a bell for him as the manner is for one vvhich is to departe the vvorlde, vvhich as it might proceed from ſome diſcompoſedneſſe, ſo I proteſt before God I did not know of vntill I heard the bell toll, and there vppõ asked the cauſe. He had indeed the fauour graunted him to reſigne (being firſt lavvfully expelled) his ſubmiſſion vvith many teares & promiſe to vs all vvhoe vvear there that he vvould euer after cary himſelf in good ſorte. That he hath borne malice tovvarde me, I am ſory he hath giuen ſuch cauſe to think, as in the libell is vttered, and I could haue vvished that his vertue had obliterated all thoſe things which then paſſed, and that he had not by his comportemẽt ſince, loſt thoſe good motions vvhich his humiliation cauſed him to vtter then. For being charged in Oxon amongſt very many things (vvhich I vvould be loath to vtter) vvith forgery by one Stãckliffe his fellovvburſar, it ſeemeth ſtrange to me that in this libell mention is made of ſo many things, vvhich muſt needs be foyſted

(as Fishers memoriall Fishers confession, for a great parte, my letters deliuered in Millan) and amongst many other one fol. 153. *And vvhich is further* (sayth the libeller) *it vvas discouered by the same papers and other letters out of England that they had particuler designements to make themselues Bishops and Archbishops* (speaking of D. Bishop and M. Charnok) *vvherevppon in some letters it vvas vvritten to your LL.*

And not vnlike is the narration of M. Iames Hauley his going to a play, and keeping in my chamber for feare of correction, as he is novv a Gentleman of great vvorth and commendation, so was he in his yong yeares of rare expectation and cõposed behauiour. I doubt not but M. Parsons remembreth vvell he vvas one of the tvventy nine or thirty vvhich to his face came before the Masters and fellovves of the College, to demaund iustice, yet vvith that modesty vvhich for the tyme (others being eager enough to speak and vrge) made him sylent, which since I haue often recounted vvith and commended him. And therefore I maruell at his boldenes in mentionning him but much more in remembring the matter of eating flesh, except he vvould register his ovvne perpetuall infamy. For going about beyond all extremity of lavv, to dravv diuerse (seuen or eight as I remẽber) of good reputation in daunger of their liues for taking after the fashion of schollers certayn

puddings frō a pupill of his called hims, dealt with the youths Fa. & would needs haue him enter into bāds vnto him, that he should not releaſe the proſecution of fellony, vvhich M. Parſons vvould haue the matter brought vnto. The indignity vvas ſo great as the matter was ſignified vnto the priuy Councell and by their order ended, the partyes accuſed being made ſecure and Parſons notorious for giuing occaſion of a common by worde, Parſons puddings. Wherein he should haue giuen me thankes for ſaying (if it had bin true) that in Oxon vve vvere vvont to drawe all matters to fellony, in transfiguring that to my ſelf vvhich was true of him. Whereas for myne owne priuate, I thank almighty God, I neuer in all my lyfe accuſed any man of fellony, or any other thing, nor euer commenced any action either criminall or Ciuill againſt any man, nor vvas euer conuented before any Magiſtrate vvhen I vvas at liberty, but for matter of Catholik fayth & Religiō.

Concerning which the libeller maketh an obiectiō about a place of Scripture of the day of iudgement not knowne to the ſonne of man, alleadged for defence of equiuocations. For my defence of the Scriptures and euery title of them I truſt I haue giuen ſufficient proof. This place is abſurdly alleadged for equiuocations as out of the vvord *ſcire*, with vvhich the libeller is little acquaynted, Soto doth learnedly prooue in his booke *De*

tegendo & retegendo ſecretum. And ſome of the Ieſuits confeſſe, that this place vvere alleadgeable for equiuocation in matters of fayth if it were in any, for that Chriſte his knowledg of the day of doome is a matter of fayth, neither vvill this letter diſcharge F. Wallpoole, (for vvhich purpoſe it ſeemeth framed) of whome concerning Squires matter it is well knowne vvhat the ſayd party confeſſed if I doe not miſtake him. But his latter letter and manner of his taking is ſo impudēt a forgery, as I ſee not how any man can giue credit to the former, if the libeller ſay true, that the ſame man wrote bothe. I might take occaſiō here to ſpeak of the propoſitions vvhich the libeller maketh daungerous, and I know not what, vvhich he obiecteth in his owne name concerning obedience & confirmation, &c. and in the name of one Benſted againſt me concerning equiuocations. But to deale with him out of the ſphere of his actiuity were no victory, and yet might increaſe a ſwelling humor in him which redoundeth already. Neither need I to defend the letters ſent from Wisbich and Framingham ſigned by my ſelf and others, they be extant, let him vrge them to the vttermoſt. Thoſe particulars vvhich he rehearſeth in the Apologie, come out of his ovvne forge. He ſayth certayn peremptory demaundes vvere ſett downe to the Pope fol. 134. and there vppon calleth me a reſolute

lavvmaker: I muſt call him a reſolutely-maker. The title prefixed to thoſe demaunds vvas. *The points for vvhich moſt humble ſupplicatiõ is to be made to his Holines.* He ſayth vve haue abuſed M. Blakvvell. We vvish M. Blakwell had not abuſed himſelf & the vvole vvorlde. Befor the brief he vvas an vſurper and ſince his pretended decretalls and cenſures he is holden to be excommunicate vvith all his cõplices, of vvhich as he hath written to the Nuncio in Flaunders, ſo may he to the Inquiſition or his Holines. Since tvvoe or three lavvfull appeals made to the ſea Apoſtolik (vvhich are acknowledged in the Apology) his authority (if euer he had any) being ſuſpended, it vvas a playn rebellion againſt Gods Church in him to medle further to hinder as much and as dispightfully as he could all appellation, to oppoſe himſelf againſt the Vniuerſity of Paris, to cõtemne the learning, practiſe, and canons of the vvhole Churche (a fevv cõplices of his ovvne excepted) & to make himſelf in his ovvne cauſe a ſupreme, peremptory, infallible and inappellable iudge. The moſt Reuerend Bishop of Tricarica Viceprotector of England vvrote vnto him to ſee all things reſtored *in integrum*. His deſpicable anſwear shevveth vvhat indeed his regard of the Popes deputyes is, and conſequently of the Pope himſelf. We vvrote vnto him from Framingham of diuers falſifications which he vſed in cyting our letters,

vvhereof one vvas, vvhich is retyted agayn in the Apologie fol. 82. that he should ſend 2200 pounds to Flauders. Is not this an admirable vvorld vvhen an vntruthe shalbe auerred, noted, iterated, corrected, and yet agayn and agayn repeated? ſpecially in a matter of ſuch iniquity as is the indeuoring to ſtarue the confeſſors of Chriſte in priſon. Which iniuſtice (wherevnto beſides a number of like intollerable grieuances to the Saynts of God M. Blakvvell hath concurred) cannot be counteruayled in Gods iudgement or an vncauteriated conſcience with a vayn, vnprofitable, daungerous, and ſurrepted title.

F. Parſons vvho ſtandeth ſo much in the Apology vpon his booke of reſolution, I vvish not the diminution of commendations due to his labour (althogh it be nothing ſo much as he vvould haue the vvorld beleeue) but his continuance in handeling that obiect. As to ſome priuate friends of his, ſome yeares agoe talking vvith me about the myſteryes of the Churche of England, and ſygnifying they heard ſome vvere about to ſett out Parſons life I then tolde, that I vnderſtood many vvere exaſperated vvith him for diuers and iuſt cauſes, and knovv no reaſon vvhy they ſhould ſpare him, and therefore vvished he vvould leaue of with detractiõs & practizings to irritate men: ſo in one commõ letter vvhich in the Apol. he ſayth vvas to be

shewed to the Pope, we gaue a ſufficient cu-
ueat *Cito indignabitur libertas ſi opprimitur*. or
as he eyteth it (if truly) fol. 18. *ſi prematur*.
That vvhich he ſhould haue taken for a warning to him ſelf he maketh a matter of exclamation againſt vs (ſaith he) *theſe good liber tines. &c.* And I know not vvhether ſome of them from vvhome it proceeded will ſay, ſee this calumniator, ſee this ignorant cenſurer, ſee this vnlearned Atheiſt. They be the wordes of S. Hier. in his Epiſtle to Theophilus Patriarch of Alexandria, againſt Iohn Biſhop of Hieruſalem, and now Ariſtippus vvill make S. Hierome a libertine, I know not how farr in rigor his reprehenſion may be drawen in ſpeaking againſt defence of liberty, ſpecially Eccleſiaſticall.

Is not ſuch a mans talke of peace like the ſpeach of frier Rush after he had ſet all by the eares. He wrote I knovv letters to M. Collington and both the Bennetts pretending a deſire of peace. And I am vvitnes that all three moſt ſincerely and charitably indeauored to procure peace, offering all reaſonable conditions, and more then vvas fitt. M. Collington at the firſt comming of the brief came to Wisbich and vppon his conſcience proteſted, that he thought M. Blackvvells authority vvould do good to England (a great inducement for quieting things then) vpon fayre wordes and promiſes made to him and M.

Mush by M. Blakvvell, vvherein of M. Blak. ment truly as is thought then and of him ſelf he did, he hath bin egregiouſly abuſed and transported ſince. If he ment fraudulently (vvhich the euent might perſuade) he is as faythles a man as liueth vppon the earth. Among other things he promiſed the return of D. Bishop and M. Charnok the reſtoring of facultyes to M. Benſon, M. Hill, and M. Tepeſt, and diuers other things in particuler which he knovveth, beſides a generall & inuiolable atonement for all matters paſſed.

Nothing was performed but new picking of olde quarrells (vvhich the Pope in his laſte brief ſayth he ſorrovvfully repeateth) Heervppon a nevv and vvorſe trooble ariſing beſides the requeſts, letters, and caueats of many to M. Blakvvell and the Ieſuits. M. Clerk and M. Mountford (tvvoe vvorthy prieſtes) came to conferr vvith vs at Wisbich, wrote to M. Blak. deliuered their letters to M. Hues, who vvith M. Wright and others vvitneſſed M. Blakvv. promis made to them in London, that all olde quarrels should be buried, M. Iohn Bennet and his brother came to London at the ſame tyme to procure pacification, M. Iohn Bennet in his anſvvere to F. Parſons (vvhich I think beſore this he hath ſeen) recounteth vvith vvhat trauayles, expences, & demiſſe offers, they ſought for quietnes. with inconſtancy diſdayn and intollerable haugh-

tines all their indeuours vvere requited.

Herevppon the Appeale vvas forced and the vvant of conſcience in the libeller diſcouered, vvhich pretendeth I knovv not vvhat compact vvith the Councell to make the Appeal, and yet not intent to proſecute it, one being as true as the other, and both shameles and vvitleſſe ſurmiſes, vvhich kynde of dealing if he continue in, he shal deſerue in ſteed of a redd capp a blevv whetſtone. The giuing and debarring of orders and facultyes, partially and almoſt ſacrilegiouſly, the hindering and excluding of graduated and mature men from our Seminaryes, the factious admitting of them vvich come thither the alluring of ſome there vvith the oppreſſiō of others, the contempt of the ſecular prieſtes being the body of the Clergy, the infaming ſo many Saints of God vvith horrible and continuall ſlaunders, the manifolde irritations of the temporall ſtate, the indaungering of Catholicks, the variouſe fraude in getting mony within the realm and transporting it without, the ſuperfluous and ſcandalous expences of many, the ſupporte of many vnworthy men, vnlawfull aſſertions and enormous iniuryes, the indeauoring to ſtarue many Worthy Catholiks at liberty and confeſſors of Chriſt in priſon, the contempt of all lavves, all canons all appeals, and all Chriſtian proceeding with vs doe conuince the libeller of the neceſſity

and intended purſuite of the Appeal. Three reconciliations the ſeculer Prieſts vvith yielding of their right, haue condiſcended vnto, vvhich all haue bin broken by their aduerſaries, for the fourth nothing vvas omitted vvhich was requiſite, and more tendered then iuſt hope and deſert occaſioned.

The perſons of our aduerſaryes vve pray for, their iniuryes vve haue referred to God and our lavvfull Magiſtrate, not onely affirming but alſo vvishing, and not vvishing alſo but indeuoring to effect that vvhich the Prophet ſayth, *Iuſtitia & pax oſculatæ ſunt.*

By Chriſtopher Bagshavv Prieſt and Doctor of Diuinity.

FINIS.